

VOL 55/NO 5

**THE
CLASSICAL
JOURNAL**

FEBRUARY 1960

February 1960

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

vol 55 | no 5

Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes

Acquired by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: CORNELIUS C. VERMEULE 193

The Year of Tibullus' Death: WILLIAM T. AVERY 205

THE FORUM 210

The Archonship of Cleisthenes: WESLEY E. THOMPSON 217

More Remarks on the Archonship of Cleisthenes: JAMES W. ALEXANDER 220

Some Classical Side Lights on Colonial Education: RICHARD M. GUMMERE 223

BOOK REVIEWS 233

Announcements 240

EDITORIAL BOARD

editor-in-chief: NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University
for the atlantic states: FRANKLIN B. KRAUS, Pennsylvania State University
for new england: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College
for the pacific states: W. M. GREEN, University of California
book reviews: FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., Indiana University
the forum: MRS. MARGARET M. FORBES, University of Minnesota
from other journals: ROGER A. HORNEBY, State University of Iowa
we see by the papers: GRAVES H. THOMPSON, Hampden-Sydney College

BUSINESS STAFF

managing editor: J. D. SADLER, Furman University
circulation manager: PAUL R. MURPHY, Ohio University

PRODUCTION

design consultant: WILLIAM FRIEDMAN, Albright Art Gallery
technical assistant: RONALD W. STERKEL, Indiana University

The Classical Journal is published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., with the cooperation of the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Pacific States, and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Athens, Ohio, with an additional entry at Wilmette, Ill., entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.

GREEK, ETRUSCAN AND ROMAN BRONZES
ACQUIRED BY THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON

CORNELIUS C. VERMEULE

THE TWELVE BRONZES discussed and illustrated here have been acquired by the Department of Classical Art of the Museum of Fine Arts during the last seven years. The dates and methods of acquisition are given in the notes. With the exception of the Greek Archaic statuette of Athena Promachos, which was well known when in a private collection in Spain, and the protome of a man-headed bull, published by H. A. Cahn in 1954, all the pieces are little known and are now adequately illustrated for the first time.

The group is by no means all the bronzes added to the collection in Boston in recent years but is representative and covers all periods of ancient art from Greek Geometric to Roman provincial. Several of the pieces were purchased not only for their own merits but with an eye to filling gaps in the collections.

GROUP OF FOUR SHEEP, Greek, Geometric, probably dating in the eighth century B.C. (Fig. 1). The sheep are shown in pairs on a rectangular platform and with a T-shaped bar extending rearwards.¹ The subject is very rare, there being no comparable bronze among the hordes of Geometric figurines found at Olympia, Delphi and elsewhere. The nearest parallel is provided by the group on the top of a votive pastoral staff found at Delphi and probably dedicated in the Hermeion there. Here we see a Geometric shepherd, perhaps Hermes Nomios, driving a single sheep to market, to pasture or to sacrifice.² The group on the top of the staff serves to explain the T-shaped bar behind the sheep illustrated here. There were once, no doubt, two shepherds represented as herding their charges along the road, much as one might see the same scene in Greece today.

Fig. 1 Group of Four Sheep



The scene thus takes its place among the class of Geometric bronzes which show daily-life subjects and which come from a votive context. No doubt the man who dedicated the group at some shrine in Greece was thinking of the present or potential prosperity of his flocks. The sheep take their place alongside the groups of horses and foals, dancers in a circle, and yoked quadrupeds, fascinating glimpses of daily life in the Greek world over a century before the dawn of monumental art and in the period when Homer must have been singing of the deeds of an earlier, dimly-remembered heroic age.

A MAN AND A WOMAN SEATED IN A CART, drawn by oxen yoked to a central shaft; East Greek, probably made around 600 B.C. or slightly later (Fig. 2). This group was found at Chesme near Izmir (Smyrna) at some date in the second quarter of the last century.³ Until 1851 it was probably in the collection of H. P. Borrell, an English merchant resident in Smyrna. His collection was sold at Sotheby's on August 26, 1852, and our bronze was Lot 1541. The group next turned up as Lot 628 in Sotheby's sale of the collection of Purnell B. Purnell of Stancombe Park, Gloucestershire, May 8, 1872. A Mr. Schmidt was the purchaser, and the supposition is he took the group off to Germany where it remained until

it turned up in the New York art market in 1958. Purnell thought this bronze and a number of others found with it were Roman toys, but D. E. L. Haynes correctly identified the whole group as being early Greek primitive, in publishing the examples acquired by the British Museum in 1875.⁴ The bronze now in Boston has always been recognized as one of the most important in the hoard, even though it remained lost and unidentified by archaeologists until correctly classified by Miss Hazel Palmer two years ago.

Haynes made the tempting suggestion that the hoard of bronzes to which this example belonged might have been deposited at a shrine to the Asiatic goddess Cybele, and that the then-lost man and woman in a cart might be Cybele and her consort Attis. The other figurines included men ploughing, animals, fish, serpents and mythological creatures. Unfortunately the identification as Cybele and Attis cannot stand up to the fact that the man turns out to be the larger figure and is bearded. Zeus and Hera immediately spring to mind as the mythological alternative, although there is no reason why the pair could not be Zeus and Cybele. Both had cults well-established among the Greeks of Lydia in the early sixth century B.C. Or, if one does not wish to read a mythological context into the scene, there is no reason why the pair are not merely a farmer and his spouse driving up to the shrine or off to market, as in the case of the four sheep just discussed. The superficially Geometric quality of the group is really to be attributed to primitive workmanship, not to an earlier date. Haynes has pointed out that some of the mythological creatures, merman, sphinxes and sirens, are too sophisticated for Greek art of an earlier period. When one looks closely at "Zeus" in the group illustrated here, one sees he has the large round eye and spade beard of early Archaic art. The shape of his skull and nose recalls that of Heracles on the famous amphora in Athens,

Fig. 2 Man and Woman in a Cart





Fig. 3 Athena Promachos

showing Heracles about to slay the centaur Nessus. This vase is generally dated about 610 B.C.

ATHENA PROMACHOS, once holding a spear in the raised right hand and a shield on the bent left arm; Greek, Archaic period, about 510 B.C. (Fig. 3). The crest of the helmet was also cast separately and is now missing.⁵ The Athena Promachos was found before 1833 on the island of Minorca and, after staying in the Ramis y Ramis collection there, passed to the Vives collection in Madrid, where it attracted wide notice among historians of ancient art

in Spain. It is certainly among the three or four most important works of Greek art found in that country.⁶

At first glance one might say that the Athena was a provincial imitation of Attic art, but this is a superficial impression created by the tubular shape of the limbs and the deep, decisive incision of aegis, chiton and himation. The closest parallel for the bronze, in fact its twin in every respect, is an example found on the Acropolis in Athens and preserved in the National Museum of that city.⁷ The next closest piece in every respect is the Athena

Promachos in the Oppermann collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. This bronze was also found on the Athenian Acropolis, in 1836.⁸ One is led to the conclusion that the Athena from Minorca was made in Athens and exported westward at some subsequent date. The figure is the counterpart in bronze of the Athena, trademark of the city, on Panathenaic amphorae of the late Archaic and Classical periods. One would suspect that this group of bronzes copies the late Archaic Athena Promachos destroyed by the Persians when they sacked the Acropolis in 480 B.C.

PROTOME OF A RIVER-GOD, in the form of the head and neck of a man-headed bull; Greek, about 460 B.C., said to have been found in or near Syracuse (Fig. 4). The face is bearded, and the mane hangs down either side below the horns; the neck is formed of the typical, loose skin of the bull, treated in broad folds or large wrinkles.⁹ The bronze is cast solid, and the rivet-hole at the break on the left and the curved underside suggest that this protome adorned the rim of a large vessel. The presence of a river-god on the rim of a large bronze louter or water basin would be most appropriate.

The most popular river-god represented in this fashion is Acheloös, the largest river in Greece, flowing south between Acarnania and Aetolia into the

Ionian Sea at the entrance to the Gulf of Corinth. Acheloös, oldest of the 3000 river-god brothers and (according to some) the son of Oceanus and Tethys, was popular on Attic reliefs dedicated in the fifth and fourth century B.C. to Hermes and the nymphs. Closer to Syracuse, on the other hand, we have the river-god Gelas, who appears on contemporary coins of Gela as a man-headed bull swimming in his river. The city even had a statue of its patron represented in this semi-bovine guise. Although somewhat corroded, the bronze has a charm of directness produced by the unusualness of the subject in this medium during the great century of Greek art.

From Greek art of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., we move northwards in Italy to Etruria to consider two statuettes.

A MAN WEARING A SHORT-SLEEVED TUNIC AND TOGA, Etruscan, Archaic period, probably made between 510 and 480 B.C. (Fig. 5). The right arm was brought forward, and the raised left hand is pierced vertically to hold a scepter or thunderbolt. The bulging eyes with prominent lashes are set off by the short hair, mustache and short beard. Both tunic and toga are decorated with chevron designs on the borders; all the details are incised.¹⁰

The exciting thing about the figure is the way in which the artist has turned a good Archaic Greek model into something very simple and schematized. A parallel in Berlin suggests that, if not a ruler or priest, this figure is Zeus Keraunios.¹¹ Unlike the comparable Greek statuettes which are always nude, the Etruscan Zeus is clothed. This likens him to the multitude of Cypriote votive statues of gods, rulers or priests surviving from the fifth century B.C., and it is perhaps something brought by the Etruscan ruling classes from the Near East which leads them to prefer their figures clad in long garments rather than represented in the athletic nude. The fact that the statuette in Boston raises his

Fig. 4 Protome of a River-God





Fig. 5 Man in Tunic and Toga

left rather than his right hand might make him a mortal rather than the Father of the Gods, who prefers to hurl his thunderbolts with his right hand.

A WARRIOR, from the lid of a cista or from the top of a decorative candelabrum; late Etruscan, third century B.C., acquired a number of years ago in Florence (Fig. 6). The warrior wears a round helmet which has lost its crest, a leather cuirass with large shoulder straps and greaves from above the knees to the ankles. He held a spear vertically in the raised right hand, and a short sword and small round shield appear in his left hand.¹²

This bronze is a product of the period when Etruscan art is merging into that of the rising Roman Republic. The form of the cuirass, with its two rows of large tabs or *ptéruges*, with the large, triangular shoulder straps and with the tunic visible beneath the lower row of tabs, is that diffused throughout the early Hellenistic world by the soldiers of Alexander the Great. The largest, grandest bronze of the group with which this example belongs is the so-called Mars from Todi, now in the Vatican. As with the Archaic Etruscan statuette discussed previously, one cannot be sure whether a divinity (Mars) or merely a mortal warrior is intended here. A statuette of a warrior in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore shows the same rather crude features of the face, with large, triangular eyes, a squashy nose and heavy lips on a broad face.¹³ Several other comparable figures have been noticed by cataloguers in years past, one of the closest being a group of two

Fig. 6 A Warrior (perhaps Mars)



warriors from the top of a candelabrum, once in a private collection (Sarti) in Italy.¹⁴

We return now to the art of the Greek world in the Hellenistic period and to the art of the period when Roman power and taste dictated the choice of subjects executed by artists in the ancient world. The first statuette is unquestionably the work of the Hellenistic period and is perhaps the masterpiece of the group of bronzes discussed in these pages. We know that its last owner, a man living in Greek or Roman Gaul, prized the piece as a work of art in a collection of other bronzes of Hellenistic origin and comparable quality. This owner even displayed the piece in a fashion we would consider barbarous today, suspended in the air with a copper dowel sunk into the center of the back. The subject differs from all else discussed so far, in that it obviously has no religious or votive context; it is pure genre, and therefore pure art.

A NEGRO BOY. His head is bent somewhat forward, as if nodding in the urgency of an important speech (Fig. 7). He wears an ample himation, wrapped around his body and over his clenched left fist. His right hand, at his side, was crooked or pierced to hold something now missing. This was undoubtedly a scroll or *rotulus* manuscript.¹⁵ As already indicated, the negro boy has a great and fascinating provenance and history of discovery. In 1764 a farmer, working the rich land in the valley at Chalon-sur-Saône, came across an oak chest containing a cache of eighteen bronzes of exceptional quality and in superb state of preservation, all being characterized by an even black patina only possible on account of careful tinting and lacquering of the surfaces in antiquity. The greatest French collector of the century, the learned Comte de Caylus, promptly acquired the find. Shortly thereafter, for obvious reasons, he presented twelve of the eighteen bronzes to King Louis XV, then at the height of his career as an

inspirer of patronesses of the arts. These bronzes, which reached the royal cabinet on Caylus' death in 1765, now ornament the collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. One of the twelve was the Alexandrine Hellenistic bronze of a negro lad playing the flutes, long recognized as a landmark of later Greek art. The Comte de Caylus kept the remaining six bronzes and bequeathed them to his nephew, the Duc de Caylus.¹⁶ Through these channels the negro boy now in Boston descended by inheritance to the owner through whose offices acquisition of the statuette was initiated.

The bronze is delicately finished, with the fleecy hair, the face and the bent legs of the subject being carefully delineated. The drapery is very precisely modeled. The important thing about the piece in Greek art as a whole is that it dignifies the subject. Usually the Greeks represented non-Greek races as social commentaries or in comic, even degrading poses. The negro boy presented here is a product of the Hellenistic (Alexandrian?) love of representing children as orators, a theme to which touches of whimsy were usually imparted.¹⁷ There is only the noblest of whimsy here. The little boy making his speech is deadly serious, and the fact that he is of African descent is testimony to the broadness of the Greek world, especially the Graeco-Egyptian world after Ptolemy II added Ethiopia on the upper Nile to Macedonian Greek Egypt. We can imagine him as some princely lad from upper Egypt or beyond, sent to study among the philosophers and teachers of rhetoric in Alexandria.

The statuette of the negro boy has a connection with monumental art and the representation of ancient men of intellect which may not be accidental. Several other Hellenistic statuettes in bronze, marble and terracotta preserve reflections of well-known statues of great Greek men of letters. The Socrates in the British Museum,¹⁸ the Demosthenes in a private collection in



Fig. 7 A Negro Boy



Fig. 8 Harpocrates

New York,¹⁹ and the statuette identified as possibly Hermarchus of Mytilene, in the Metropolitan Museum of New York,²⁰ are among the leading examples. In the realm of these bronzes showing children as orators, it is interesting how they often are posed like their counterparts representing famous men. Thus, two similar bronzes of orating children in Baltimore and Boston pose their subjects in the manner of the statue of Sophocles in the Lateran.²¹ Is it, therefore, merely the coincidence of oratorical gestures that the negro boy discussed here is line for line like the pose of the Epicurean Hermarchus in New York? Or can we perhaps see this as a standard pose for Epicureans and identify the negro boy as a student in one of the schools of that philosophy? At any rate, all

this speculation does not cloud the freshness, the precision and the nobility with which the subject is presented on such a small scale.

HARPOCRATES, represented as a chubby child wearing an elaborate headdress topped by the *uraeus* characteristic of the Egyptian god Horus. His right hand points to his mouth, and he carries cornucopiae in the left (Fig. 8). The statuette was found in western Asia Minor, where cults of the Egyptian divinities were widespread in Hellenistic and Roman times.²² In spite of the rough, light-green patina covering the bronze, it is easy to see that the work is of the best quality. Whether the bronze was made in Hellenistic or Gaeco-Roman times, it is not a mass-production Harpocrates, examples of which crowd every major museum in Europe and the Near East.²³

The subject is certainly a bizarre one among classical bronzes. In Hellenistic times the baby god Eros or Cupid was developed into the concept of the Egyptian Harpocrates, the infant Horus, who was originally represented as sucking his finger and later as merely placing it close to his lips. This gesture, in its earlier form, was erroneously interpreted by the Romans as one of silence, and hence they gave to the child Horus (Har-pa-chrat in Egyptian) the name of Harpocrates whom they regarded as the god of silence. The popularity of the type stemmed not so much from the religious connections but, as is obvious here, from the late Hellenistic love of the child form.²⁴

Harpocrates appears in reliefs and on Alexandrine coins together with Isis and Sarapis, and the triad was worshipped not only in Alexandria but in Rome where all three had shrines in the Iseum and Sarapeum of the Campus Martius. The evidence of the statuette types with which the Harpocrates of this bronze appears suggests the ultimate prototype was a cult-statue set up in Alexandria in the third century B.C.



Fig. 9 Zeus

ZEUS. He once had a scepter in his raised left hand and probably a thunderbolt in the right (Fig. 9). He wears a short-sleeved chiton, an ample himation draped over the left shoulder and down the left side, and sandals. This Roman imperial bronze is covered with red, green and brown patinas.²⁵

This figure illustrates the freedom with which the iconographic types of the major divinities were interchanged, combined and confused in Roman imperial times. The pose and presentation is certainly a logical one for Zeus; the head with its luxuriant hair and beard recalls Greek fourth-century work of Lysippus, Bryaxis and sculptors of the early Hellenistic period. When we look for similar bronzes, however, we find that the Roman artist who cast this piece borrowed the pose and details of costume from Graeco-Roman representations of Sarapis. He merely omitted the kalathos or modius, the



Fig. 10 A Votary

basket-like grain measure on top of the god's head, and turned the figure back into a Zeus. He altered the attribute in the right hand, no doubt, from a patera to the fulmen.²⁶ The transformation of Sarapis-Hades back into Zeus completes a full circle, for the colossal statues of Sarapis seated and standing made for the sanctuaries of Ptolemaic Alexandria in the early third century B.C. had been inspired by comparable statues of Zeus in Asia Minor and in Greece proper.

A VOTARY, PROBABLY A PRIEST OF DIANA. The figure is shown walking forward, a patera or libation dish in the extended right hand and a small flat object (an incense jar?) in the left (Fig. 10). The man wears an ample himation and a headdress composed of large, floppy leaves.²⁷ The provenance of this bronze is known, but the precise details are somewhat confused. In 1908 the firm of Spink and Son in London offered

for sale a small bronze statue of Diana or a priestess and a group of seven male and female votaries, one of which appears to have been the statuette illustrated here. The large lady was dubbed "The Deified Drusilla," and the group (to which the bronze in Boston definitely belonged at one time) was said to have been salvaged from Caligula's pleasure galleys in Lake Nemi in 1895. Its fame was such that King Edward VII commanded a private view of these pieces at Kensington Palace shortly before his death in 1910. The central figure of the group was acquired by the British Museum a decade later, and some of the smaller figures, including the one discussed here, have been turning up in the art market and in auction catalogues off and on ever since.²⁸

The story about the bronzes being salvaged from Caligula's barges does not obscure the fact that the group was found during the widespread archaeological activity of the British Ambassador Sir Savile Lumley (Lord Savile) and Prince Orsini around the shrine of Diana and the lake, both on the Orsini estates in the area. The story also does not hide the fact that the bronzes, whatever the appeal of their subjects, are of the highest quality; the votary in Boston in addition has an even, dark-brown patina. The subjects are central Italian of the period when late Etruscan, Hellenistic and Roman art were fusing into one, in the service of native cults (ca. 50 B.C. — 50 A.D.). Our votary turns up in almost identical form at dozens of Italic and late Etruscan sites from Praeneste to Etruria. If the group was made for the emperor Caligula (37-41 A.D.) or if he treasured them as contemporary works of art in an older tradition, these figures represent the best in Italian Hellenistic art before Italy and the Latin West were inundated with craftsmen and art forms from Greece and the Hellenistic East.

STEELYARD BUST OF NIKE OR VICTORIA. She is shown with a chiton pinned on the left shoulder and draped loosely



Fig. 11 Steelyard Bust of Nike

across her chest; her wings are represented in almost rudimentary fashion, without the feathers being indicated (Fig. 11). The pupils of her eyes are drilled. The hook for suspension passed through the topknot of her hair, and the back of the bronze is filled with lead, as is usual to achieve a balance corresponding exactly to the weight of the pan in which items were weighed. On stylistic grounds, this steelyard weight can be dated between the middle of the second century and the last quarter of the third century A.D. Since it was acquired in Paris, it may have been made in Roman Gaul.²⁹

Steelyard balances afforded Hellenistic and Roman craftsmen a wonderful opportunity to explore the decorative possibilities of a freestanding, hanging half-figure. Nike or Victoria is a rare subject for one of these balances. The usual subjects are Athena (goddess of wisdom and therefore of balances), Hermes (god of commerce, and of thieves!), Alexander the Great (as gen-



Fig. 12 Doorknocker or Handle

eral patron of the Hellenistic world) and various Roman emperors. Artemis, as patroness of several great cities in Asia Minor, turns up as a Hellenistic steelyard bust from Izmir (Smyrna) added to the collections in Boston in 1958.³⁰ The subject of a steelyard bust, of course, had to be someone on the top of whose head the ring for suspension would not look out of place. Nike and Artemis have Hellenistic topknots; Athena, Alexander and the Roman emperors wear helmets; and Hermes has his cap with wings. In late Roman and Byzantine times busts of the helmeted Dea Roma and empresses with elaborate crowns and coiffures were very fashionable as balances.³¹ The iconographic and stylistic parallel for the bust shown here lies not among steelyard weights but in appliqué busts from chests and other items of furniture; there are good examples in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and in Karlsruhe.³²

DOORKNOCKER OR HANDLE FROM A CHEST, in the form of a lion's head with a ring through the mouth (Fig. 12). This functional object, with its highly stylized and somewhat provincial treatment of subject, was acquired in Paris, and the presence of similar objects in the Louvre and in French provincial museums suggests it was made in Roman Gaul about the same time as the steelyard balance discussed previously.³³ Doorknockers in the form of ringed lion protomes were found in the Greek fifth-century levels of Olynthus,³⁴ and by the Hellenistic period they are common from all parts of the ancient world. Such objects were also used with equal frequency as ornaments on wooden chests and, in the Roman imperial East, on wooden sarcophagi.³⁵ The example shown here has the remains of the iron pins by which it was fastened to the door or chest. In either case it could not have stood heavy use and certainly could not have been used to lift something, for the bronze (particularly where the ring passes through the mouth) is too thin. The excellent preservation is enhanced by a rich green patina.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

The photographs for this article were prepared by Mr. Edward J. Moore and his colleagues. I wish also to thank Mrs. Sybille Haynes, Miss Dorothy K. Hill, Herbert Hoffmann, Miss Hazel Palmer, Miss Lucy Turnbull and Saul Weinberg for help on various points.

¹ Accession number 58.1189; Samuel Putnam Avery Fund; maximum width: 0.07m.; *Museum of Fine Arts, Annual Report* (Boston, 1958) p. 31.

² *BCH* 48 (1924) 477 f., fig. 10.

³ Acc. no. 58.696; John Michael Rodocanachi Fund; H.: 0.063m., L.: 0.107m.; *Annual Report* (Boston, 1958) p. 31.

⁴ *JHS* 72 (1952) 79 f., where all details can be found; one of the groups of ploughmen, with reversed oxen, has also turned up, in the S. Morgenroth collection: *Ancient Art in American Private Collections*, Fogg Art Museum, 1954-1955 (Cambridge, Mass.) p. 30, no. 193, pl. 58.

⁵ Acc. no. 54.145; William E. Nickerson Fund No. 2; H.: 0.106m.; H. Palmer, *Annual Report* (Boston, 1954) p. 6.

⁶ A. García y Bellido, *Los hallazgos griegos de España* (Madrid, 1936) pp. 52 f., no. 13, with

bibliography, pl. XXIV, XXV; also his *Hispania Graecia* (Barcelona, 1948) pl. XXXI.

⁷ A. De Ridder, *Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes* (Paris, 1896) pp. 306 f., no. 789, fig. 295 (which is National Museum no. 6456); see also De Ridder, no. 783.

⁸ E. Babelon, J.-A. Blanchet, *Catalogue des bronzes antiques de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1895) no. 149. Hans Georg Niemeyer of Hamburg is planning a full publication of the group.

⁹ Acc. no. 59.552; Gift of Dr. Herbert A. Cahn; H.: 0.046m., L.: 0.06m.; *Monnaies et Médailles*, Basel, Auction Sale XIV, June 19, 1954, no. 28.

¹⁰ Acc. no. 52.187; Gift of Mrs. Edward Jackson Holmes; H.: 0.14m.; H. Palmer, *Annual Report* (Boston, 1952) p. 19.

¹¹ E. H. Richardson, *MAAR* 21 (1953) 85, fig. 1.

¹² Acc. no. 58.1281; Gift of Mr. Horace L. Mayer; H.: 0.11m.; *Annual Report* (Boston, 1958) p. 31.

¹³ D. K. Hill, *Catalogue of Classical Bronze Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery* (Baltimore, 1949) pp. 55 f., no. 113, pl. 26.

¹⁴ F. Messerschmidt, "Untersuchungen zum Mars von Todt," *RM* 43 (1928) 146 ff., esp. 152 and 153 f., fig. 3.

¹⁵ Acc. no. 59.11; J. H. and E. A. Payne Fund; H.: 0.08m.

¹⁶ J. Babelon, *Les trésors du Cabinet des Antiques, Choix de bronzes de la Collection Caylus, donnée au Roi en 1762* (Brussels and Paris, 1928) pp. 28 ff., where the story is retold in connection with Caylus' earlier gifts to King Louis XV.

¹⁷ G. M. A. Hanfmann, *Record of the Art Museum* (Princeton, 1943) vol. 2, part 1, p. 8.

¹⁸ "Socrates and Aspasia," *CJ* 54 (1958) 50 f., fig. 3.

¹⁹ M. Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (New York, 1955) p. 67, figs. 226 ff.; there is no need to question the authenticity of this statuette, which is said to have been found near Ankara and which wandered from the Istanbul art market to a dealer in Salonika, before the importance of the piece was recognized by Solomon Reinach.

²⁰ See recently, G. M. A. Richter, *Greek Portraits II, To what extent were they faithful likenesses?* (Collection Latomus, vol. XXXVI [Brussels, 1959]) pp. 25 f., fig. 37.

²¹ Baltimore: Hill (above, note 13) p. 74, no.

158; Boston: G. H. Chase, *Greek and Roman Antiquities, A Guide to the Classical Collection* (Boston, 1950) pp. 116 f., fig. 141.

²² Acc. no. 59.30; Gift of the Curator; H.: 0.176m.

²³ On the subject in general, see Hill (above, note 13) pp. 36 ff., in connection with the eight examples of varying types and degrees of quality in Baltimore (nos. 68-75).

²⁴ For this subject in relation to Roman art, see recently: V. von Gonzenbach (Mrs. Christoph Clairmont), *Untersuchungen zu den Knabenweihen im Isiskult der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Bonn, 1957).

²⁵ Acc. no. 59.298; John Michael Rodocanachi Fund; H.: 0.118m.

²⁶ This can be seen by studying the bronzes in S. Reinach, *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine* (Paris, 1906-1930) vol. 5, p. 8, no. 5 (Collection Fouquet, pl. 21) and no. 6 (Vente Borelli-bey, pl. 30); also vol. 2, p. 13, no. 1, where the chiton is omitted as is usual with Zeus rather than Sarapis (von Rath collection, sold at Sotheby's June 18, 1891, lot 45, pl. III).

²⁷ Acc. no. 59.10; J. H. and E. A. Payne Fund; H.: 0.201m.

²⁸ The saga is told in brief, with references, in *AJA* 60 (1956) 339.

²⁹ Acc. no. 59.653; Classical Department Purchase Fund; H.: 0.09m.

³⁰ *Greek and Byzantine Studies* 1 (1958) 109, fig. 21.

³¹ See recently, C. Vermeule, *The Goddess Roma in the Art of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1959) pp. 90 f. and refs.

³² Babelon and Blanchet (above, note 8) p. 296, no. 684; C. Schumacher, *Beschreibung der Sammlung antiker Bronzen zu Karlsruhe* (Karlsruhe, 1890) pl. VII.

³³ Acc. no. 59.654; Classical Department Purchase Fund; H. (of disc): 0.115m.

³⁴ All parallels for this and later periods are collected in D. M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus, Part X* (Baltimore, 1941) pp. 249 ff.

³⁵ The most amusing publication of one of these bronzes is that in the *Paul I. Iltan Collection*, H. M. F. Schulman, Auction, New York, November 21, 1959, lot 199, plate 1, "From Jerusalem where it decorated the gate of a noble descended from the Royal house of David. About 100 A.D."

THE YEAR OF TIBULLUS' DEATH

WILLIAM T. AVERY

SCHOLARLY OPINION has been all but unanimous in fixing the date of Tibullus' death at 19 B.C.¹ The sole source adduced has been the familiar epigram attributed to Domitius Marsus, which reads as follows: *Te quoque Vergilio comitem non aequa, Tibulle, / Mors iuvenem campos misit ad Elysios, / ne foret aut elegis molles qui fleret amores / aut caneret forti regia bella pede*. Vergil died on September 21, 19 B.C.; hence the words *Vergilio comitem* have been taken to date the death of Tibullus as of the same year.

Now we know that the *Aeneid* could not have been edited and published by Varius and Tucca, or by Varius alone, as some think, by the end of 19 B.C. Few scholars venture a publication date for the *Aeneid*, but it seems generally felt that 18 or 17 is likely.² Therefore, if one could show that the *Aeneid* was already in circulation when Tibullus died, the date of his death would move perforce to a later year. Ovid would appear to point in this direction.

The threnody for Tibullus, *Amores* 3. 9, was most certainly written at the time of the poet's passing,³ not somewhat later as a remote tribute, which, of course, would have no chronological implications in the present connection. With this fact in mind, let us note that at *Amores* 3. 9. 13-14, in a passage de-

scriptive of the grief of Cupid and Venus (7-16) at the death of the poet of love, Ovid writes: *Fratris in Aeneae sic illum [scil. Cupid] funere dicunt / egressum tectis, pulcher Iule, tuis*. The words *fratris in Aeneae* at the beginning of the line surely hark back to *Aeneid* 1. 667,⁴ where Venus says to Cupid: *Frater ut Aeneas pelago tuus omnia circum / litora iactetur odiis Iunonis acerbae, / nota tibi . . .* (667-69). The pertinent elements (*fratris / frater* and *Aeneae / Aeneas*) are parallel not only from the standpoint of vocabulary, but also with respect to position in the line and to metrical values. Of equal significance is the fact that Ovid's *pulcher Iule* represents a favorite Vergilian tag. The combination *pulcher Iulus* occurs a total of four times as a line-ending in the *Aeneid* (5. 570; 7. 107; 9. 293, 310; cf. also 7. 477-78). All of the above correspondences, combined with the fact that Aeneas and Iulus come in for mention at all in the Ovid,⁵ certainly indicate that the *Aeneid* had been published before Ovid wrote the lament for Tibullus.

This conclusion is most cogently supported by verse 27 of the same elegy, where Ovid says of Homer: *hunc quoque summa dies nigro submersit Averno*. It would be hard to doubt that this line derives from Vergil's words about the babes in limbo whom *abstulit*

atra dies et funere mersit acerbo (Aen. 6. 429), which is repeated verbatim of Pallas at Aeneid 11. 28.⁶ Thus in Ovid's elegy on the death of Tibullus, written at the time of that event, we find most arresting reminiscences of the Aeneid, which must therefore have been in the bookstalls when Tibullus died. And Ovid's testimony on the matter does not end here.

In *Amores* 1. 15 Ovid boasts that poetry and the fame deriving to the author thereof last forever: *Vivet Maeonides* (9), *vivet et Ascræus* (11), *Batiades semper toto cantabitur orbe* (13), and so on for Sophocles, Aratus, Menander, Ennius and Accius, Varro of Atax and Lucretius (15-24). Then of Vergil: *Tityrus et segetes, Aeneiaque arma legentur*, / *Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit* (25-26), from which we may know that the Aeneid had been published somewhat earlier. In the next distich is the following: *donec erunt ignes arcusque Cupidinis arma*, / *discentur numeri, culte Tibulle, tui* (27-28). The list of poets comes to a close with Gallus: *Gallus et Hesperii et Gallus notus Eois*, / *et sua cum Gallo nota Lycoris erit* (29-30). It will be observed that all of the poets are referred to indirectly by means of verbs in the third person and with the names of the poets as subjects or in some oblique relation to the verbs — all, that is, except Tibullus who alone is addressed in the vocative *culte Tibulle* (28), and whose measures are spoken of as *numeri tui* (28), and who, therefore, must have been alive at the time.⁷ Taking this fact together with the unmistakable reference to the Aeneid in Ovid's *Aeneiaque arma* in verse 25, one must conclude once more that Tibullus lived to see the Aeneid published, i.e., at least until 18 or 17 B.C.⁸ Further precision may be possible, but first we must dispose of another matter.

It has been remarked that the only evidence advanced in support of the assignment of Tibullus' death to 19 B.C. is the phrase *Vergilio comitem* in the first line of Marsus' epigram. It is sug-

gested that this phrase has been seized upon without reflection and taken to mean something that it did not mean in the mind of the author. There is no need whatsoever to interpret the words as signifying that the poets died in the same year. This point is self-evident from the Latin, but were it not, Ovid proves it for us. In *Amores* 3. 9, again the elegy on Tibullus, he leads up to the close with a prophecy (59-66):

Si tamen e nobis aliquid nisi nomen et
umbra
restat, in Elysia valle Tibullus erit.
Obvius huic venias hedera iuvenalia
cinctus
tempora cum Calvo, docte Catulle, tuo;
tu quoque, si falsum est temerati crimen
amici,
sanguinis atque animae prodige Galle
tuae.
His comes umbra tua est; siqua est modo
corporis umbra,
auxisti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios.⁹

Catullus died ca. 54, Calvus in 47, Gallus in 26,¹⁰ and Tibullus died seven years later than the last of these, even if we follow the premature and erroneous dating of 19 B.C. as the year of his death. And yet Ovid can employ the word *comes* to express the relationship that he expects to exist between the shade of Tibullus and those of the other poets named. To put it bluntly, if *Vergilio comitem* must mean that Tibullus died in the same year as Vergil, then *his comes* in Ovid, *Amores* 3. 9. 65 must mean that Tibullus died in the same years (!) as Catullus, Calvus and Gallus. *Quid plura?* Marsus' *Vergilio comitem* has nothing whatsoever to do with the date of Tibullus' death. The time-spread which the word *comes* is capable of embracing in contexts such as those of Marsus and Ovid is infinite. The previous error in interpreting *comitem* in the epigram amounts to this: the word was taken to refer literally to a "companionship" of time, a simultaneousness of death; whereas the fact is rather that the "companionship" intended was one of professional interest, talent, life's work, etc., which consideration dictated that the two should be

comites in the afterlife. Looking once more at the epigram, it seems quite clear that the meaning is: "Unjust Death sent you too, O elegant Tibullus, while still young, to the Elysian Fields, to be a companion to Vergil, so that there might be [i.e., with the result that there was] no one to weep over gentle love in elegies or to sing of kingly wars in the epic strain." In other words, *Vergilio comitem* does not mean "as a companion to Vergil" in the sense that the two left this life at the same time, but rather *ut Vergilio comes post mortem esses*. In Marsus, Tibullus and Vergil are *comites* after death because both were poets in life, albeit of two distinct genres, as Marsus points out in his last two lines: *ne foret aut elegis molles qui fletet amores/ aut caneret forti regia bella pede*. In Ovid, the "companionship" is even closer, if you will: all of the poets whose ghosts are to be *comites* in the Elysian Vale wrote elegies.

The assignment of like with like to individual areas of the world below is a natural one. How far back in classical literature or beyond its origins lie would be a matter for investigation independent hereof. It is enough that one recalls at once the groupings observed by Vergil himself in the *Aeneid*, where like goes with like whether the spiritual companionship of the souls concerned is based upon a common virtue, interest, or pursuit in life on the one hand, or upon a common crime or sin on the other. Here, of course, lay to a great degree the source of inspiration for Dante in his complex subdivision of Hell, and even of the other realms as well. Let us look at Vergil for a moment.

Nec vero hae sine sorte datae, sine iudice, sedes:/ quaesitor Minos urnam movet (*Aen.* 6. 431-32). So Vergil tells us that the allocation of the various souls to their respective abodes in the netherworld was not wholly haphazard. *Ille silentium/ conciliumque vocat vitasque et crimina discit* (432-33), Vergil continues. Rhadamanthus too is sys-

tematic: *castigatque auditque dolos subigitque fateri*, etc. (567). To what end the inquisition if not to have a basis upon which to decide with what class of sinners a soul was to be placed as a *comes*? An excellent example of the clean-cut sectioning of Hades is seen in the following: *lamque arva tenebant/ ultima, quae bello clari secreta frequentant* (477-78). Suicides (434-39), brother-haters (608), parent-beaters (609), cheats in general (609-11), adulterers slain for their crime (612), traitors (613-14) — the souls of all of these are forever *comites* of their own kind. And so it is with the "inhabitants" of the *loci laeti* as well: athletes (642-43), and, of interest to us, poets, under the leadership of Orpheus (644-47), heroes, warriors and priests, seers and scientists (648 ff.) — all are in their separate communities.

Another pertinent instance of the same sort has been reserved for last place for a special reason: the case of those *quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit* (*Aen.* 6. 442). Here are Phaedra, Procris and Eriphyle (445), Evadne and Pasiphaë (447), and then Vergil has: *his Laodamia/ it comes et iuvenis quondam, nunc femina, Caeneus/ rursus* (447-49). Thus Vergil corroborates the specific argument with which we are momentarily concerned by grouping together certain souls as *comites* because of their common guilt in life. But of further interest is the fact that Vergil's *his Laodamia/ it comes* is Ovid's *his comes umbra tua est*, which we have already seen at *Amores* 3. 9. 65, words addressed to the deceased Tibullus in the elegy on his death: additional evidence to the effect that the *Aeneid* was in circulation when Tibullus died.

There is one more instance of the systematic partitioning of the abode of the dead which it is difficult to ignore even though it lies outside the stricter boundaries of the classical tradition: the identical conceit of union after death among the shades of poets not only of different periods, but even of

different nations, languages and literatures, seen in the classic case of Dante, who, while still alive, is made sixth in the *bella scola*, which consists of Homer, Horace, Ovid, Vergil and Lucan (*Inf.* 4. 70-102). In the poetic imagination, the shades of Robert Frost and T. S. Eliot will one day be *comites* of the shades of Pindar, of Prudentius, of Villon, of Tasso, and of the unknown author of the *Poema del Mio Cid*.

We have, then, established two points beyond question: (1) Marsus does not say that Tibullus died in 19 B.C., which year no longer holds any meaning for us in connection with the poet's death, and (2) Tibullus died after the publication of the *Aeneid*. It now remains to consider in what year the death actually did occur.

The only obvious limitation now imposed upon us in an attempt to determine the correct date of Tibullus' death is Marsus' designation of him as a *iuvēnis* at the time.¹¹ If we knew when Tibullus was born something might be made of the fact that the period of *iuvēntus* is commonly agreed to end with the fortieth year. Unfortunately, however, the birthdate has been placed as early as 60 and as late as 48,¹² thus making speculation along these lines to no purpose. But we may be able to establish a *terminus ante quem* on the basis of another consideration.

The *Amores*, of which the ninth elegy of the third book is the lament for Tibullus, appeared in the first edition ca. 12 B.C.¹³ We are then relatively safe in assuming that Tibullus died no later than this date. It would seem that more cannot be said at present, except perhaps for the citing of an *argumentum ex silentio* based on the works of Tibullus himself. The Macer who is off to the wars in Tibullus 2. 6. 1 (*Castra Macer sequitur: tenero quid fiet Amori?*) died in Asia Minor in 16 B.C.¹⁴ Nowhere in the *Corpus Tibullianum* do we find a threnody on his death, although Macer and Tibullus were apparently friends.¹⁵ This silence

might conceivably be taken as evidence that Tibullus preceded Macer in death and therefore died in 16 B.C. at the latest.¹⁶

It is felt that the correction of prevalent opinion concerning the date of Tibullus' death is important enough *per se* to have warranted the present investigation. But perhaps of equal significance is the fact that statements made in other connections in histories of Latin literature and based upon the erroneous 19 B.C. can and must now be rectified. For example, both Schanz-Hosius¹⁷ and Duff,¹⁸ in discussing the publication date of Ovid's *Amores*, state that the earliest event referred to therein is 19 B.C., "the death of Tibullus," and cite *Amores* 3. 9 as evidence. There are no doubt similar instances of inaccuracy elsewhere.

University of Maryland

¹ See introductions and notes of editions, literary histories, classical dictionaries, etc. Of a great number of such works consulted only Sellar (W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets* [Oxford, 1899] p. 234), Bignone in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (s.v. "Tibullo," p. 811) and Jackson Knight (W. F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil*, 2nd ed. [London, 1944] p. 44) say otherwise. Sellar's date is 18, Bignone's 19 or 18, and Jackson Knight's 16, which is possibly a misprint for 19. None cites authority in any form.

² See for example J. W. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome* (Golden Age), ed. A. M. Duff (London, 1953) p. 350: "about 17 B.C." and Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil*, p. 44, who allows "a year or a little longer" after Vergil's death. Büchner (*RE*, VIII, 2, s.v. "P. Vergilius Maro," 1431) says no more than "sehr bald" and cites Horace, *Carm. Saec.* 49 as evidence that the *Aeneid* was in the hands of the public by 17 (May 31).

³ So by implication Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, part 2, 4th ed. (Munich, 1935) p. 211 and Duff, *Literary History*, p. 427. Cf. *Antologia Tibulliana*, ed. A. Santoro (Bologna, 1957) "Introduzione," p. 9. This fact is quite apparent from Ovid's use of tenses.

⁴ Cf. Tibullus 2. 5. 39: *volitantis frater amoris*, but see footnote 16 below.

⁵ Mention of Venus and Cupid stems, of course, from the fact that Tibullus wrote love poetry; but the step from there to the reference to Aeneas and Iulus is quite another matter, dictated by a wholly different consideration, as indicated above.

⁶ In fact, Ovid's verse would seem to be a contamination of more than one Vergilian line. At *Aen.* 2. 324-25, Panthus tells Aeneas: *venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus/ Dardaniae. Jupi-*

ter tells Hercules at Aen. 10. 467-68: *stat sua cuique dies; breve et irreparabile tempus/ omnis est vitae*, where *cuique dies* has the ring of *summa dies*. Cf. also Lucr. 3. 898-99: *omnia ademit/ una dies infesta tibi tot praemia vitae*.

⁷ No special intimacy could have prompted this personal note, for Ovid did not know Tibullus personally (Trist. 4. 10. 51-52). The vocative *Tibulle* in verse 1 of Marsus' epigram, definitely written after the poet's death, does not alter our interpretation, since it is the usual vocative of epitaphs, where direct address and the first and second persons are very common. Marsus' epigram is called an epitaph in the Ambrosian MS (see app. crit. ad loc. in *Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, ed. J. P. Postgate, 2nd ed. [Oxford, 1915, repr. 1955] ad fin.). See footnote 9 below.

⁸ *Amores* 1. 1. 1-2: *Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam/ edere* would seem to recall Aen. 1. 1, but such introductory pieces were (and are) frequently written last.

⁹ Ovid's use of *docte Catulle* in verse 62 and of *culte Tibulle* in verse 66 does not alter our assumption that *culte Tibulle* in *Amores* 1. 15. 28 shows that Tibullus was alive when the poem was written. In *Amores* 3. 9 all of the elegists mentioned—Calvus, Catullus, Gallus and Tibullus—are dead beyond question and the vocatives have no special significance. What makes the vocative *culte Tibulle* stand out in *Amores* 1. 15 is the fact that only Tibullus of all the poets is thus addressed.

¹⁰ See *OCD* under respective heads.

¹¹ The statement *obit adolescens* in the vita of Tibullus which follows the epigram of Marsus in

the MSS is merely a rewording of Marsus' *iuvem* as is clear from what follows: *ut indicat epigramma supra scriptum*.

¹² For the extremes see Schanz-Hosius (above, note 3) p. 181 (cf. *The Oxford Companion*, s.v. "Tibullus") and *The Roman Elegiac Poets*, ed. K. P. Harrington (New York, 1914) p. 32. Duff (*Lit. Hist.* p. 403) gives ca. 55.

¹³ Owen in the *OCD*, s.v. "Ovid" says shortly after 16 B.C. and cites *Amores* 1. 14. 45: *Nunc tibi captivos mittit Germania crines*. But Duff (*Lit. Hist.* p. 427), no doubt thinking of verse 49 of the same poem as referring to Drusus' victory over the Sugambri in 12 B.C., gives this latter date, which would seem to be the more logical one.

¹⁴ Hieron. *Chron.* ad Ol. 191, 1 = 16 B.C. See Schanz-Hosius (above, note 3) p. 164 and A. Rostagni, *Svetonio De poetis e biografi minori* (Torino, 1944) pp. 132-33.

¹⁵ See Schanz-Hosius, p. 164 and Rostagni, p. 132.

¹⁶ The great number of correspondences between Tibullus' Books 1 and 2 and the *Aeneid* are of no use as evidence for present purposes. If the parallels between Tibullus 1 and the *Aeneid* represent literary indebtedness, Vergil is the debtor, since Tibullus 1 was published ca. 26 B.C. (Schanz-Hosius, p. 181; *OCD*, s.v. "Tibullus"). Book 2, which contains some of the most striking parallels to passages in the *Aeneid*, definitely appeared before Tibullus' death (Santoro [above, note 3] p. 9), but any attempt to argue positively from a comparison between the two would result in the sheerest guesswork.

¹⁷ P. 211.

¹⁸ *Lit. Hist.* p. 427.

THE FORUM

editor MARGARET M. FORBES

ADDISON'S CATO AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

BY COMPARISON with other Founding Fathers the education of George Washington was sadly deficient, and we cannot associate him with the great classical backgrounds of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Wilson and a score of others. Thus classical influences on George Washington seem scarcely worth mentioning. There was, however, one influence, already noted in the pages of *The Classical Journal*,¹ that was so potent and lasting as to deserve further elaboration and comment. This was the person and character of Cato the Younger; not the Cato portrayed by Plutarch but the Cato of the play by Joseph Addison, of the early eighteenth century in England.

The *Cato* of Addison was one of the most popular plays in England for almost a half century after its first production in 1713. This popularity moved to America in due time, and Benjamin Franklin printed four dozen copies of the play in 1743 for William Parks of Williamsburg. In 1758 there was a production of the play at Belvoir, Virginia, with Mrs. Sally Cary Fairfax taking the part of Marcia, the Addison daughter of Cato. This is no place to delve into the reprehensible, but highly respectable, love of Washington for Sally Fairfax. The fact of her amateur appearance in this theatrical piece did inspire him, however, to write her these lines:

My time would be more agreeably spent
in playing a part in
Cato with the company you mention, and
myself doubly
happy in being Juba to such a Marcia, as
you must make.²

Even before the Belvoir production, Washington showed his familiarity with *Cato* in a short poem, said to be his only one, addressed to Frances Alexander in 1749 or 1750. His lines are these:

Ah! Woe's me, that I should love and
conceal
Long have I wish'd but never dare reveal.

In Act I, Scene 4 of Addison's *Cato*, Juba cries out:

Why wilt thou urge me to confess a flame
I long have stifled and wou'd fain conceal?

These youthful references, significant as they are, do not tell the whole story. Two lines of Portius, an Addison son of Cato, were quoted or paraphrased repeatedly by Washington in letters to his comrades during dark days of the Revolution. They are found in Act I, Scene 2:

'Tis not in mortals to command success,
but we'll do more, Sempronius,
We'll deserve it.

At Valley Forge Washington had the play presented to bolster morale, with himself and Mrs. Washington in attendance. We are told that his soldiers packed the playhouse to the doors since the play was, in fact, the very Bible of republican idealism.³ Washington had a great affection for the theater, for tragedy as it was then, as is evident in the ledger items for tickets bought and in his frequent quotations from the plays of Shakespeare, especially *Hamlet*, and from Addison's *Cato*. It is in *Cato*, however, that he could combine a tendency toward Stoic philosophy and, at the same time, the highest political idealism.

Joseph Addison had completed four acts of his *Cato* by 1703. But Addison was more confident of his role in *The Spectator* than as a playwright. So it was not until 1713 that the play was finished, and opening night was April 14 of that year at Drury Lane. England was in a turmoil of Whig and Tory political agitation. The play had been well advertised for its political implications, and the house was packed. In fact, the house was packed with claqueurs, the friends of rival politicians. The first production was a sensation, the adherents of both political parties "shouted themselves hoarse in an endeavor to show that they and they alone respected liberty."⁴ In actual fact the play should have given much more comfort to the more republican-minded Whigs, but the Tories had their turns. When popular liberty seemed lost the Whigs had the best of it. But when Cato denounced a military dictatorship, with reference to Caesar, the Tories howled. For Marlborough had, indeed,

attempted to persuade Queen Anne to establish one. And Lord Bolingbroke, the great Tory leader, hatched up a brilliant stratagem during the course of the play. He collected a sum of money from his friends and presented the actor Booth, taking the part of Cato, with a purse of fifty guineas as if to announce publicly that the play was theirs. It is sad to report that although all authorities give the figure of fifty guineas as the amount of the purse the sum collected by Bolingbroke was said to be fifty-four guineas.

And the *Cato* was more than a political success. Addison had satisfied the classical idealism that was so strong in the reign of Queen Anne, so strong, in fact, that the age is known as the Augustan Age of English literature. Alexander Pope wrote a prologue to the play (in couplets, to be sure) and in it he said:

Our scene precariously subsists too long
On French translations and Italian song.

These lines were especially popular with the Whigs who denounced French classicism and Italian opera as unpatriotic. Addison was the literary hero of the day. The *Cato* ran for weeks at the Drury Lane and by 1750 had had some one hundred eighty-four productions at the Drury Lane, Goodman's Fields and Covent Garden. In the 1738-39 season at the Drury Lane it had six productions to five of *Hamlet*. Because Addison followed the pseudo-Aristotelian rules of the drama as practised on the continent, the *Cato* was translated into Italian, French and German. It received high praise from Voltaire and critics everywhere, probably because it was "classical."

And now about the play itself, the play that created such a theatrical, political and literary sensation in Europe, and the play whose leading character was to be so profoundly admired by the Pater Patriae of America itself. Is it a great play and is it classical? On both counts a resounding no! The play has five acts, it has a hero who is not a tragic hero simply because he is too good. It has a villain in Sempronius, a henchman of Caesar constantly plotting intrigue in Utica behind Cato's back. It has an intensely honorable love sub-plot in the love of Juba, a loyal Numidian prince, for Marcia. It has another love theme in the love of Marcus and Portius, sons of Cato, for Lucia, daughter of the Senator Lucius. So Portius must die, honorably, to get him out of the way. And Sempronius must die, dishonorably, because he was a villain. And Cato must die because he was a superlatively good man. But we are led to suspect

that all will be well for Juba and Marcia. So the play is comedy, or melodrama, with all the overtones of the morality plays, of the age of chivalry, of the misinterpretations of Aristotle, of the Senecan flavor so much desired and loved by the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth and — alas — twentieth-century audiences.

Some of the lines may give better clues: Sempronius, Act I, Scene 2, "Curse on the stripling"; Juba, Act I, Scene 4, "The virtuous Marcia towers above her sex: / True, she is fair, (Oh, how divinely fair!)"; Juba, Act II, Scene 5, "To do an act that would destroy my honor?"; Sempronius, Act III, Scene 5, "Confusion to the villains, all is lost."

And, yet, there are many passages of such idealism, sincerity and straightforward expression that we need not wonder too much at the popularity of the play with practical, hard-headed realists. There are dozens of quotable quotes because this was still the essence of dramatic meaning and of long standing usage. So, in all fairness, let a few be selected. Juba, Act I, Scene 4:

... turn up thy eyes to Cato!
There may'st thou see to what godlike height
The Roman virtues lift up mortal man.

He strives with thirst and hunger, toil and heat;
And when his fortune sets before him all
The pomps and pleasures that his soul can wish,
His rigid virtue will accept none.

Cato, Act II, Scene 1:

A day, an hour, of virtuous liberty
Is worth a whole eternity in bondage.

Cato, Act IV, Scene 4:

In humble virtues, and a rural life,
There live retired, pray for the peace of Rome.
Content thyself to be obscurely good.
When vice prevails, and impious men bear sway,
The post of honor is a private station.

Lucius, Act V, Scene 4 (close):

Cato, though dead, shall protect his friends.
From hence, let fierce contending nations know
What dire effects from civil discord flow.
'Tis this that shakes our country with alarms,
And gives up Rome a prey to Roman arms,

Produces fraud, and cruelty, and strife,
And robs the guilty world of Cato's life.

Sentiments such as these are, truly, not ill-befitting the conscience and actions of the first citizen of a new, inspired concept of human society.

HENRY C. MONTGOMERY

Miami University

¹ H. C. Montgomery, "Washington the Stoic," *CJ* 31 (1936) 371-73.

² Quoted from John C. Fitzpatrick, *George Washington Himself* (Indianapolis, 1933) p. 112.

³ John Corbin, *The Unknown Washington* (New York, London, 1930) p. 73.

⁴ Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama, 1700-1750* (Cambridge, 1925) p. 88.

REACTION TO THE ACLS PANEL

The following letter is printed with the consent of the writer and of Professor Paul MacKendrick, Chairman of the Panel.

June 2, 1959

PROFESSOR PRATT'S SUMMARY in the May *CJ* of the ACLS Classics Panel I have read with great interest, as for some time now it has seemed to me that we need to be critical of the Latin that we are offering in our schools. These things often come to a head in odd ways. In my own case the climax comes in that my oldest daughter next September will embark on Latin II in a good school here, and I feel sure that there ought to be a better Latin fare than the Caesar and the propaedeutic for Caesar that will constitute the Latin element in her education. The same holds true for boys also. Ennui sets in after a certain stage in all too many young minds. I am not thinking of the ordinary run-of-the-mill type of boy either. It is the better boy who suffers more. The valuable side effects, such as the part that Gaul played in contributing to the Roman Empire soldiers and statesmen and writers, or the interplay of party politics mean little to the student, for they come to him when quite inexperienced and uninformed.

The great virtue of the traditional ladder has been that it provides an opportunity to know one author fairly well, Caesar, Cicero, or Vergil. But where success is most possible, in Caesar, it strikes me as least worthwhile, because of the nature of the contents. When some degree of mastery has been achieved, it certainly imparts a

sense of accomplishment; but where does one go with these assets of military vocabulary and ideas? And are they needful for a better understanding of ourselves and our world? The curriculum in Latin has in a sense had an advantage over the modern languages in going straight to classical authors. And if we criticize the second year, we must also do likewise for the first, which aims at direct preparation for the second.

It is probably the very difficulty of providing an adequate substitute which has caused us so long to hold to the traditional sequence. How much Caesar should we retain? I would myself be satisfied with the Seventh Book of the *Commentaries*, if Caesar is to be retained. What are the substitutes? Eutropius is too jejune. Curtius Rufus is interesting and could be pruned, but he is not concerned with things Roman. This holds true for Erasmus also. Whatever the reading, it must not be beyond the capacity, preparation, interests and experience of 15-16-year olds.

The requirements of a suitable reader pose difficult and almost contradictory demands. We would want a vocabulary range that would not be too wide, yet we would want to include some of the great writers. Livy, Cicero, Augustine, Tacitus. We would want to select material for its intrinsic interest, and we would want to illustrate the moral values in literature. We would want to show Latin as the parent of some modern languages, and we would want to correlate with English Literature. We would want to record the great events in Roman history, and we would want to cover a wide range perhaps in Roman, Christian and modern Latin.

Snippets might well be desultory and aimless. Yet they need not be. They may constitute a carefully chosen anthology. One finds books of this sort in use in French and Italian schools. D. Bertini's *Lecture latine per la Scuola media* (Milano, 1951) is such an anthology. It draws from Phaedrus, Eutropius, the Vulgate, Nepos, Caesar, Cicero's *Letters*, Tibullus and Ovid; it gives an outline of each author's life and provides some twenty illustrations for the text. There is no vocabulary at the end of the book; instead, facing each page of text is given the vocabulary needed for that page. With a book of this sort it is possible to illustrate a fairly wide range of authors and topics. It would be possible to sample myth, traditions, home life, wit, wisdom, anecdotes and fables, biographies, *exempla virtutis* and famous events.

Again, classical authors can be drawn from in a simplified form. This is done for modern languages. *Classics Illustrated* has for years offered juveniles versions of novels and poems in simplified form. And there is no reason why Latin authors should be sacrosanct; but the Latin language and its idiom should be preserved. Some agreement is needed here on what could best serve the purpose, and on what the purpose should be. But it should be possible to make great use of Livy, Cicero and even the poets. Nor should the Vulgate, or Mediaeval Latin, or hymns, or the *Carmina Burana* be overlooked.

In third-year Latin the task is obviously much simpler. But here too the course needs to be revised. We could well throw out *De Imperio Cn. Pompei*, *Pro Archia*, the *Catilinarians*, admirable though they are in their kind; speeches, however excellent, are not altogether congenial to adolescents. They rarely read them in English courses as they are felt to lack appeal. But as there must be some speeches of Cicero represented, possibly parts of *Pro Roscio*, the *Verrines* and the *Philippics* would be more appropriate. The *Letters* and some of the philosophy should be better represented. More from Pliny, some Erasmus, a play of Plautus (adapted), the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, *Catonis Disticha* and some Vergil might possibly be used in Latin III.

All of this is meant to indicate that I agree wholeheartedly that there are improvements to be made, that this is a matter of national concern and that it requires long, hard thinking by all of us who value the study of Latin in the education of our children. . . .

ALLAN G. GILLINGHAM

Phillips Academy
Andover

A PROPOSAL

DURING THE SUMMER of 1958, it was my good fortune to travel in Europe. Most of my vacation was centered in Paris, and it was during my Paris stay that an alarming, though probably well-known fact forced itself into my consciousness—a large number of American French teachers were unable to communicate with any reasonable ease with the natives.

Appalling as this fact is, I admire those French teachers for facing reality and embarrassment in order to arrive at a realistic command of the language. For by the end

of the summer their ability to communicate was considerably improved.

In recent years there has been general recognition of the fact that the methods involved in the teaching of foreign languages stand in need of serious cogitation. We have seen the introduction of new methods, based largely upon an oral-aural approach. And the consensus seems to be that, while our thinking is still in the formative stage, the new methods have a great deal to offer. One cry, however, is being raised more vigorously each year: our programs simply are not intensive enough. The ideal situation is one like that of the French teachers in Paris—totally immersed in the language, they eat it, sleep it, live it. Admittedly this is an ideal situation of which most learners cannot avail themselves. Even the teachers of a language cannot always live for a time in the country to which their language is native.

Most of us know something of the Summer Language Schools at Middlebury College. These are probably the most efficient language schools in the world, and a quick look at the College Bulletin tells us why.

"Success hinges upon the consistent enforcement of the basic Middlebury rule—the segregation of students from the contact with English; complete concentration upon the foreign language; exclusive use of the language in and out of the classroom; and careful attention to the individual needs of each student. Each school has its separate residences and dining halls and a faculty of native instructors. During the entire session, the foreign language is the sole medium of communication in work and play. From the day of arrival students are pledged to speak the foreign language."

"The quality of instruction offered at the Middlebury Schools is well known. As compared with foreign travel or study, a summer session here is more economical, provides courses better suited to the needs of American teachers, and gives an uninterrupted and intensive training not found in foreign institutions."

We in the Classics have been slow to admit the need for change. It is only in the last few years that any serious revision of methods has been attempted, particularly the Structural Approach of Dr. Sweet and the Natural Method of Father Most.

While I suppose many of us have been content that we have mastered the *Gallie Wars* sufficiently well to be able to answer all student questions, we must, if we are honest, admit that picking up a piece of Latin literature which we have not seen before presents us with a most embarrass-

ing situation. Let us admit it, we must take our place alongside those French teachers.

I wish therefore to present to you, the Classics teachers, from whom progress must ultimately come, the following proposal.

A school of Latin, and possibly Greek, must be established in this country, similar to the Summer Schools at Middlebury, a school where the individual can completely immerse himself in the Classics. Every effort should be made to staff it adequately and supply it with needed materials. The problems of oral Latin are manifold, and as I envision it this school shall be the supreme authority or rather the ultimate source of assistance.

I have been engaged, with the very enthusiastic cooperation of my local administration, in a research project in oral Latin. One thing impresses me more than others—it's *every man for himself*. There are a lot of things available in oral Latin, from the scholarly dictionary of Msgr. Bacci to the delightful little booklet by Robert Traver Brown, but there is no agreement. If we are to be effective, we must work together.

It is with this in mind that I suggest that the staff of the proposed institution be employed full time to satisfy our most pressing needs: a dictionary of neologisms, a textbook on the syntax of conversation, the development of various idioms for special situations—the classroom, for example. Most of us could not teach in Latin, simply because we do not know the classroom jargon; for the most part there probably is no classroom jargon. Yet what an important advance is methodology is instruction using the language itself. This school would have to be the source of the teaching aids we would certainly need: movies, newspapers, records of popular songs, radio programs (if only tape recorded).

It may be objected that we are not seeking to teach spoken Latin because spoken Latin is today non-existent. We must remember, however, that the current trend toward the conversational approach, even for the modern languages, is not based on the thesis that the spoken language has in recent years become the only object of language study. The main purpose of studying a foreign language, modern or ancient, is now just what it has always been, to gain a command of the language sufficiently well to enable one to read the literature of that language. The conversational method is just that, a method. It is thought that one can learn to read a language much more readily

by studying it synthetically rather than analytically, and the distinction finds its tools in the conversational approach as opposed to the so-called traditional approach.

These are the reflections of a classroom teacher who claims no other qualifications than average ability in his subject, a tremendous love of that subject and sincerity. I shall appreciate suggestions of any sort, concerning philosophy, curriculum, financing, from you, the teachers upon whom progress depends.

JOHN J. BODOH

Arrowhead H.S.
Hartland, Wisconsin

LATIN WEEK AWARDS

FOR THE YEAR 1958-59 the Latin Week Committee of CAMWS again offered a prize in each state for the best report on a Latin Week celebration. The prize was: *The 26 Letters* by Oscar Ogg, the story of our alphabet. The state chairmen of Latin Week judged the reports and made the awards.

The following teachers and schools were honored in this way: Mrs. Oliver Coker, Talladega H.S., Talladega, Ala.; Mrs. T. J. Collier, Pine Bluff H.S., Pine Bluff, Ark.; Miss Veronica Pullan, P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, Gainesville, Fla.; Father Flattery, Marquette H.S., Ottawa, Ill.; Mr. Earl Sterner, South Side H.S., Fort Wayne, Ind.; Miss Elizabeth Smith, Frankfort H.S., Frankfort, Ky.; Mrs. Bessie Fairley, Opelousas H.S., Opelousas, La.; Miss Edna Downing, Maria Sanford Jr. H.S., Minneapolis, Minn.; Sister Eugenia, Cathedral H.S., Natchez, Miss.; Mrs. Donald Gore, Whiteville H.S., Whiteville, N.C.; Mrs. Dennis Fairley, Dunbar H.S., Dunbar, West Va.; Sister M. Dolora, St. Mary's Springs Academy, Fond Du Lac, Wis.

The state chairmen who made the awards were: H. R. Butts, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Ruby Wilson, Southwest Junior H.S., Little Rock, Ark.; Mrs. Sue Piant, Coral Gables, Fla.; Miss Susan Greer, Streator, Ill.; Miss Gertrude Johnson, Logansport, Ind.; Mrs. H. H. Whitehead, Mt. Sterling, Ky.; Mrs. Hugh Hyman, Monroe, La.; Miss Margaret Schummers, Winona, Minn.; Miss Elizabeth Conn, Clarksdale, Miss.; Dr. Charles Henderson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Miss Lucy Whitsel, Marshall College, Huntington, West Va.; Miss Theodora Taras, La Crosse, Wis.

DONNIS MARTIN, Chairman
Latin Week Committee

ADVANCED PLACEMENT LATIN EXAMINATION CANDIDATES

SINCE 1956 the College Entrance Examination Board through its Advanced Placement Program has sought to encourage secondary schools to offer special college-level courses for able students. For those students who have had these special courses, a series of examinations is provided in eleven subjects, whereby students may demonstrate their course accomplishment and colleges may have a basis for recognizing these accomplishments by awarding advanced placement and credit to these students upon matriculation. In the first year of the program under CEEB sponsorship 104 schools sent 1229 students to take 2199 examinations. Last year these numbers had grown to 355 schools, 3715 students and 6900 examinations.

Two levels of examinations in Latin are offered in this program. A Latin 4 (Vergil) examination is available for those students in an enriched fourth-year school course. The Latin 5 (Prose, Lyric Poetry, Comedy) examination is offered for those students in a fifth-year Latin course. More specific descriptions of the courses under discussion are contained in *Advanced Placement Program Syllabus*—a publication distributed by CEEB to all interested teachers.

The number of Latin 4 candidates has increased from 28 to 86 in the period 1956-58. Correspondingly the number of Latin 5 candidates has increased from 10 to 58. While the total number of Latin candidates is small—144 in 1958—the fact that they are students of Latin makes them of interest to Latin teachers. The balance of this article reports on the actions taken by colleges on those candidates who took the Latin examinations in May, 1958 and who matriculated in the fall of that year.

The source of this information is a questionnaire distributed to colleges with the candidate's examination scores. Colleges were asked to complete the questionnaire and to return one copy directly to the school at which the candidate was prepared. The original was returned to Educational Testing Service where the data were tabulated. (Dr. Marjorie Olsen, ETS Statistical Analysis Division, was responsible for the tabulations cited in this report.)

Whether or not the student received advanced placement and credit was related to at least three major factors: (1) the subject in which the student was a candidate; (2) the college attended; (3) performance on the examination. Each of these factors will be discussed separately as they relate to the Latin candidates.

The tabulation of college actions on CEEB Advanced Placement Examination candidates shows that in Latin 4, from the 70 students for whom questionnaires were received 20 (28 per cent) were awarded advanced placement, credit, or both; in Latin 5, of the 45 students 19 (42 per cent) were so treated. For all examinations in all the subjects involved (5508 questionnaires received) 2669 (48 per cent) were in this category.

This tabulation shows that the Latin candidates as a group fared less well than did candidates generally. Thirty-four per cent of all Latin candidates were granted placement, credit, or both, compared to 48 per cent of candidates of all examinations. It is also apparent that the Latin 5 candidate was more favorably treated as compared to the Latin 4 candidate. While this is understandable, it, no doubt, is a source of disappointment to the College Board Advanced Placement Latin Examiners who offer the Latin 4 examination for schools not now giving the fifth-year course.

The candidate's choice of college is a factor in whether or not he receives placement or credit. When colleges are grouped according to the number of candidates they had in all examinations, a progressive increase in the per cent granted placement or credit can be observed accompanying an increase in the total number of candidates at the institution. For example, 38 per cent of all candidates in all examinations received placement and credit at "small" colleges (colleges with less than 5 candidates) vs. 59 per cent of the candidates at "large" colleges (colleges with more than 125 candidates each). Since the total number of Latin candidates is small, a detailed analysis of the treatment of these candidates by institution of different size would not be meaningful. Yet it seems clear that the Latin candidates, as did candidates generally, fared better at those institutions which had the largest numbers of Advanced Placement candidates. It is reasonable to assume that those institutions which receive large numbers of candidates annually are more likely to have the administrative machinery in operation for handling these candidates. This in turn could give rise to a larger proportion of the candidates at these institutions receiving favorable consideration.

As would be expected, candidate performance on the examinations is an important determiner of the actions taken by colleges. In the program generally, there was slightly more than a full-grade level difference on the average between those candidates receiving credit and placement and those who

did not. The average grades for the two groups were 3.44 and 2.39, respectively, on a scale in which the grade of 5 signifies high honors, 4 honors, 3 creditable, 2 pass and 1 fail.

The tabulation of the average grades of candidates who were awarded and who were not awarded placement or credit shows that in the Latin 4 test the mean grade was 2.35 for those awarded credit and/or placement; the mean grade was 2.02 for those not so treated; in Latin 5 the two mean grades were 3.21 and 1.72, respectively. In all examinations the mean grades for the two categories were 3.44 and 2.39.

While the relationship of examination performance to college actions holds up in Latin in general, there are certain specific differences. First, for those who took the Latin 4 examination the differences were small between those awarded and those not awarded credit and placement. Secondly, the mean grade for those awarded placement and credit in Latin 4 was substantially lower than was the case for all examinations (2.35 vs. 3.44). It should be clear that colleges reacted differently to the Latin 4 candidates than they did to Latin 5 and to Advanced Placement candidates generally. Further evidence is seen in the fact that among the Latin 5 candidates who had grades of 3, 4, or 5, 93 per cent received credit, placement, or both; only 36 per cent of the Latin 4 candidates at the same examination grade levels were so recognized. In other words, a Latin 5 candidate with a grade of 3 or better was virtually assured credit, placement, or both; whereas the odds were against a Latin 4 candidate being placed or receiving credit no matter how fine his examination performance.

The questionnaires also provided the opportunity for colleges to report the reasons for their actions. Since colleges had the opportunity to cite multiple reasons and to

comment in detail, it is difficult to summarize this section of the questionnaires. Nevertheless, certain observations can be made:

1. No college withheld placement or credit in the case of Latin 5 because it regarded the examination as inadequate measure of what the college needed to know, to award credit or placement. Four institutions cited this factor as responsible for their action in the case of Latin 4 and thereby accounted for 18 candidates.

2. Seven candidates failed to receive consideration because they did not apply. Apparently at some institutions it is important that the candidate take the initiative and his failure to do so may cost him credit or placement.

3. For the Latin candidates, only one college reported that granting of credit or placement was contrary to institutional policy.

In summary, while the number of Latin 5 candidates was only 58 in 1958, the rate of increase in candidates over a three-year period was about twice that of the CEEB Advanced Placement Program generally. The number of Latin 4 candidates has increased from 38 to 86 in the period 1956-58 — an increase which parallels that in the program as a whole. While Latin candidates have not fared as well as Advanced Placement candidates generally, there was a marked difference in the college treatment of the Latin 4 and Latin 5 candidates. Virtually all candidates who took the Latin 5 examination and earned a grade of 3 or better received advanced placement, credit, or both. Slightly more than a third of the Latin 4 candidates with grades of 3 or better received advanced placement, credit, or both.

JOHN R. VALLEY

CEEB Program Director

*Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N.J.*

THE ARCHONSHIP OF CLEISTHENES

WESLEY E. THOMPSON

IN A RECENT ARTICLE in this journal,¹ Alexander challenged Meritt's identification of S.E.G. X, 352 as an archon list.² Alexander argues that three of the men listed on the stone, Kalliades, Hippias and Cleisthenes, could not have been archons. I shall try to show that his arguments, most of which are *ex silentio*, have no weight and that Meritt's reconstruction is extremely probable.

The restoration of the name [Ka]lliades cannot be used to determine whether the stone in question is an archon list. Alexander's point is that the absence of any indication on the stone that this Kalliades was different from the archon of 480/79 proves that the inscription is not an archon list. However, it may be questioned whether any distinction was necessary in view of the fact that the latter archon must have been well known since Salamis occurred during his term.³ Furthermore, if the correct restoration of the name is [Phi]lliades,⁴ the objection vanishes.

Alexander's case against an archonship for the tyrant Hippias is based on the silence of Thucydides and of the author of the *Athenaion Politeia*. He argues that Thucydides should have cited Hippias as an example of his assertion⁵ that "care was always taken to have the offices in the hands of someone in the family." (Alexander's translation) However, this statement cannot be interpreted literally, for there were not enough Peisistratids to fill one or more of the offices every year of the tyranny. Either "always" is an

exaggeration, which is highly unlikely, or the phrase *sphôn autôn* does not mean "the family." Thucydides must have used these words to mean the faction, not the family, of the Peisistratids. In this case, Thucydides could prove his point by saying, not that Hippias — as tyrant — held the archonship, but rather that Hippias — as tyrant — had his son and partisan Peisistratus hold the office. The historian cited this man on the grounds that he would be fairly well known.

Nor is Thucydides' remark⁶ that "Hippias was the eldest son and succeeded to the government" (again Alexander's translation) at all "unnecessarily general." On the contrary, it states Thucydides' thesis, that Hippias — not Hipparchus — became tyrant, which was an unofficial position, not connected with holding the archonship. In trying to prove his assertion, Thucydides need have mentioned Hippias' archonship only if Hipparchus had not held one.

Moreover, Alexander gives no reason for expecting the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* to mention Hippias' term as archon. On the contrary, that author does not discuss the early part of Hippias' tyranny. Moreover, he gives the names of archons, not to supply any additional information, but as a means of dating important events.⁷ Since he knew of nothing important that occurred during the first decade of Hippias' reign, he had no reason to mention the various archons of the period. Therefore, Alexander's *argumentum ex*

silentio must be rejected in favor of a natural assumption that Hippias did at some time hold the archonship, just as other members of his faction did. Since he, presumably, could have become archon whenever he chose, it would have been to his greatest advantage to plan to assume the post immediately after his father's death in order to facilitate his acceptance as tyrant. *S.E.G. X*, 352, if accepted as an archon list, shows that this actually occurred.

Alexander objects to Cleisthenes' archonship in 525/4 on the grounds that Herodotus says that the Alcmeonids remained in exile during the whole time which the tyranny lasted.⁸ However, the reliability of Herodotus' remark may be questioned. At this point, it must be observed that there is abundant evidence to show the existence in the fifth century of two contradictory "traditions" concerning the Alcmeonids. A comparison of the charges and countercharges of the Alcmeonids and their friends with those of their enemies will show that several of these claims are mere inventions, designed to answer rival accusations.

Alcmeonid enemies: 1. Megacles was responsible for the execution of the supporters of Cylon.⁹ 2. Harmodius and Aristogeiton expelled the tyrants.¹⁰ 3. The Alcmeonids flashed the shield signal at Marathon in a conspiracy with the Persians.¹¹ 4. Megacles was a friend of the tyrants.¹² 5. Ephialtes destroyed the power of the Areopagus.¹³

Alcmeonid replies: 1. The heads of the *naúkraroi* were responsible for the executions.¹⁴ 2. Cleisthenes and the other Alcmeonids were instrumental in expelling Hippias.¹⁵ 3. The Alcmeonids were opposed to tyranny and had been absent from Athens during Peisistratus' last reign and Hippias' tyranny.¹⁶ 4. Xanthippus was the leader of the *demos*.¹⁷ 5. Pericles was the power behind Ephialtes.¹⁸

When one considers that three of the stories favoring the Alcmeonids appear in Herodotus and that he tells also of Alkmaion's trip to Sardes,¹⁹ the mar-

riage of Megacles and Agariste,²⁰ and the building of the temple at Delphi by the Alcmeonids,²¹ it must be concluded that that family supplied Herodotus with much of his information on Athenian history. The instance which Alexander cites is clearly a retort by them to the accusation of their participation in the alleged treachery at Marathon. Although their answer may be truthful, something more than their testimony is needed to prove it. The credibility of any story spread by the Alcmeonid circle is weakened by their spurious version of the Cylonian affair. Herodotus' statement that the Alcmeonids were in exile during the entire period of the tyranny certainly does not warrant use as the only piece of positive, rather than silent, evidence in an argument, as Alexander has done.

That Alcmeonid opponents did not publicize Cleisthenes' relationship with Hippias is not surprising; few would recall the career of a political adversary seventy-five years before. Moreover, the Philaidai, who also seem to have supplied Herodotus with much historical material,²² could scarcely expose Cleisthenes' connection with the tyrants while keeping Miltiades' position hidden. Indeed, they tried to show that they were hostile to Hippias by claiming that he murdered Miltiades' father.²³

Alexander argues that Thucydides should have corrected Herodotus' version of the exile of the Alcmeonids if it were incorrect. However, we must not expect Thucydides to correct Herodotus' every error. In fact, despite Alexander's objections, Jacoby has shown that Hellanicus used an archon list.²⁴ If Cleisthenes were there listed as archon for 525/4, Hellanicus should have corrected Herodotus and eliminated any need for Thucydides to do so.

The basic fault in Alexander's case is his argument that "any reconciliation between Cleisthenes and Hippias cannot be assumed from evidence we now have." On the contrary, even without the epigraphic material, such a recon-

ciliation, which made possible Cleisthenes' return to Athens, is a necessary assumption for understanding the developments after 514. Far more "incredible" than any author's silence is the hypothesis that Cleisthenes, expelled from Athens as a teen-ager or child and an expatriate for thirty-six years, should become the leader of those exiled in connection with Hipparchus' assassination and, upon his return to the city, one of the two most powerful men within little more than a year. Since he did not seek popular support until after his defeat by Isagoras,²⁵ Cleisthenes must have had extensive support among the Athenian nobility. This is proved by the opposition to Isagoras of the *boule* which Herodotus mentions²⁶ and Cleisthenes' recall, presumably, by the same group. Whatever the identity of this *boule*,²⁷ its members were wealthy landowners and merchants. This support could not have been gained so rapidly by an almost total stranger. Rather, its source must be sought in the political maneuvering of Cleisthenes during his stay in Athens from 527 to 514.

It is highly likely that Cleisthenes was archon at some time, for, as a politician and head of Athens' leading family, he certainly would seek the office. During his ascendancy after the expulsion of Isagoras, he certainly had the power to win the post. Cadoux has made a good case for Alkmaion as archon for 507/6, the year in which the Cleisthenic constitution was put into effect.²⁸ If Cleisthenes considered it important enough to have a relative hold the archonship this year, the only explanation for his failure to hold the position himself is that he had already been archon. On Alexander's hypothesis, he could have done this only after Hippias' ouster. Cadoux has arranged the evidence on the archons of this period.²⁹ Harpaktides and Isagoras are certain for 511/10 and 508/7, respectively. Lysagoras is fairly sure for 509/8. Andocides says that Skamandrios was archon when a law was passed forbid-

ding torture.³⁰ Since there is no reason why the Athenians should wait five or more years after the end of the tyranny to pass such a measure, Skamandrios should be placed in 510/9. The only remaining possibilities for Cleisthenes' archonship are before 514 and as Isagoras' successor in 508/7, a very improbable theory.³¹

Finally, Alexander's objection to Meritt's dating of the affair at Leipsydriion is based on two arguments of Wilamowitz,³² first, that a popular uprising should have occurred if the abortive revolt occurred after the murder of Hipparchus, and, secondly, that there was too little time for the conversion of Cleisthenes from aristocrat to *prostates* of the *demos*. However, there was no uprising when either of the Spartan armies came to depose Hippias.³³ Herodotus himself states that Cleisthenes' assumption of popular leadership came after 510.³⁴ The Alcmeonids do not seem to have denied this.

The choice in interpreting the stone in question is, then, between a sound, even necessary reconstruction of sixth-century Athenian politics, which posits an alliance between Hippias and Cleisthenes, and a hypothesis that the inscription is part of a public document of ca. 425, in which — by the most extraordinary chance — the names Hippias, Cleisthenes, and Miltiades appear in that order. The odds against such an occurrence are astronomical. Furthermore, the Hippias whom Alexander cites for the late fifth century was a Thasian and does not belong in a list of citizens (especially without some identification of his status). Therefore, it must be admitted that no Hippias is known to have been an Athenian citizen during the fifth century. Thus, while it is well to subject Meritt's identification to scrutiny, it should be clear that his work has proved correct again.

Princeton Graduate School

¹ "Was Cleisthenes an Athenian Archon?" 54 (1959) 307-14. This answer was written at the suggestion of and with the aid of Professor Don-

ald W. Bradeen of the University of Cincinnati.

² Cf. *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 59 ff.

³ Cf. T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides," *JHS* 68 (1948) 111.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 111, n. 218.

⁵ 6. 54. 6.

⁶ 6. 55. 1.

⁷ Cf. Felix Jacoby, *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 1949) pp. 90 f.

⁸ 6. 123.

⁹ Thuc. 1. 126.

¹⁰ Thuc. 1. 20.

¹¹ Her. 6. 121.

¹² *Ath. Pol.* 22.

¹³ *Ibid.* 25.

¹⁴ Her. 5. 71.

¹⁵ Her. 5. 62.

¹⁶ Her. 6. 121.

¹⁷ *Ath. Pol.* 28.

¹⁸ Plut. *Pericles* 9.

¹⁹ 6. 125.

²⁰ 6. 130.

²¹ 5. 62.

²² 6. 34-41; 6. 103 f.; 6. 109-11; 6. 132-40.

²³ 6. 103.

²⁴ *Atthis*, pp. 88 f.

²⁵ Her. 5. 66.

²⁶ 5. 72.

²⁷ Cf. C. Hignett, *A History of the Athenian Constitution to the End of the Fifth Century, B.C.* (Oxford, 1952) pp. 93 ff.

²⁸ (Above, note 3) p. 114.

²⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 111-14.

³⁰ *De Myst.* 43.

³¹ Cf. Hignett (above, note 27) pp. 393 f.

³² *Aristoteles und Athen* (Berlin, 1893) vol. 1, p. 34.

³³ Her. 5. 63-65.

³⁴ 5. 66.

MORE REMARKS ON THE ARCHONSHIP OF CLEISTHENES | JAMES W. ALEXANDER

I APPRECIATE Mr. Thompson's position in questioning the conclusions of my article on Cleisthenes, and I am sure I join with him in wishing certainty were possible in this instance. I am fully aware of the weakness of negative evidence, but I believe the burden lies in proving that the stone was an archon list rather than trying to prove that it could not have been. Mr. Thompson has undoubtedly noticed how many of his arguments are based on imaginary motivations, probabilities and expedient rationalizations. Certainly the claim that "even without the epigraphic material, such a reconciliation, which made possible Cleisthenes' return to Athens, is a necessary assumption for understanding the developments after 514" is something of an exaggeration. I do not know of anyone who has made such an assumption except those who were guided by the interpretation of the stone as an archon list.

In actual fact, it seems the basic difference between Mr. Thompson's position and my own lies in our approach to the credibility of Herodotus as a

trustworthy historian. I do not see the "charges and countercharges" as a part of the traditions concerning the Alcmeonid family in any way as clear-cut and sharply opposed as they are presented in Thompson's paper. No one, I suppose, would argue that some members of the Alcmeonid family did not supply Herodotus with much of his information about Athenian history, but the conclusion that those stories which might appear to be favorable to the family are mere inventions certainly does not follow.

The positive statement by Herodotus that the Alcmeonids had been in exile during the whole time that the tyranny lasted, while perhaps open to criticism in its completely literal interpretation, cannot again be dismissed as simply a retort of the family to the charge of treachery at Marathon. The untruthfulness of such a statement would be too easy to prove at the time Herodotus was writing; any attempt of the family to defend itself in this way would have just the opposite effect, especially since the existence of an archon list with

Cleisthenes' name on it — known presumably to every Athenian — would have given the bold-faced lie to any such claim. To me this sort of evidence is as "positive" as we can get as long as we lack an absolute and certain document to indicate otherwise. Perhaps Thucydides and the author of the *Constitution of Athens*, not anticipating our interest in such matters today, did not feel it necessary to indicate that certain individuals, considered by them in other matters, also held the archonship; perhaps also, if Hellanicus did use an archon list and if Hippias' name were there, Thucydides may have felt that here too Herodotus was well enough corrected and no further mention of archonship was necessary; and Aristotle (if he was the author of the *Politeia*) may have used archons' names only to date events, and may have overlooked an apparent inaccuracy in Herodotus and Thucydides in such a point.

But it is hard to believe that there took place an incident of such great importance as a reconciliation between two such famous individuals as Hippias and Cleisthenes; that Cleisthenes would have become reconciled to the tyrants — for a cause unknown; that he would have again been exiled by the tyrants — for a cause unknown; that after several unsuccessful attempts, he would have marched on Athens at the head

of an aristocratic party to oust the tyrant with whom he had formerly been so closely associated; that no sort of indication of this extraordinary vacillation would be even remotely noticed by any ancient — or modern — historian (until the discovery of our inscription); that both Thucydides and Aristotle go through this period with minute attention to political alliances without any indication that such a reconciliation (and consequent break) ever took place. The dismissal of the first ten years of the tyranny of Hippias as a period in which "nothing important" happened is hardly tenable if indeed during this period such a reconciliation between tyrant and noble took place, bringing with it, I suppose, some modification of the relationship with Delphi. There could hardly have been anything more important, from a political point of view, happening in Athens at the time.

Finally, the two or three quotations from Thucydides are not my own translations but are the English of the Crawley translation in the Modern Library. The English of Herodotus is also given in the Modern Library edition of the Rawlinson translation. I must apologize for not indicating this in my original article.

University of Georgia

New MENTOR BOOKS for your Classics program ...

The Greek Experience

By C. M. BOWRA

A brilliant survey of classical culture, highly acclaimed in its \$6.00 hardbound edition. Complete and unabridged, with all 107 magnificent illustrations. Mentor MD275, 50c

The March Up Country

XENOPHON'S ANABASIS

The famed account of the bloody march of 10,000 Greeks, in a lively translation by W. H. D. Rouse, whose Mentor versions of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* are best-sellers in schools and colleges. Mentor MD278, 50c

Now in Use

THE OEDIPUS PLAYS OF SOPHOCLES

Translated by Paul Roche MT238, 75c

THREE GREAT PLAYS OF EURIPIDES

Translated by Rex Warner MT241, 75c

THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

By Rex Warner MD226, 50c

GREAT DIALOGUES OF PLATO

Translated by W. H. D. Rouse MD167, 50c

THE YOUNG CAESAR

By Rex Warner MD254, 50c

Coming Soon

WAR COMMENTARIES OF CAESAR

A new translation by Rex Warner
(April, 1960) MD280, 50c

THE SATYRICON OF PETRONIUS

Translated by William Arrowsmith
(June, 1960) 50c

THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

Translated by Horace Gregory
(May, 1960) MT291, 75c

A TREASURY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Selected and edited by Anne Fremantle
(March, 1960) MT285, 75c

... and other books by W. H. D. Rouse, Edith Hamilton,
A. J. Toynbee, Moses Hadas, etc. Write for our complete list.

THE NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY OF WORLD LITERATURE, INC.

Box CJ-1, 501 Madison Avenue

New York 22, N.Y.

SOME CLASSICAL SIDE LIGHTS ON COLONIAL EDUCATION

RICHARD M. GUMMERE

“WHENCE, THEN, shall we make a beginning? If you will consider this with me, I shall say, first, that you must attend to the sense of words.” (Epictetus, *Discourses* 2. 14. 14)

The educational history of our American Colonial period is the most fully documented of any provincial activity,¹ as far as facts and statistics are concerned and apart from the controversies which characterized religion and politics. Curricula, textbooks, library lists and records of all kinds are available, and if presented in full would require many volumes and the lifetime of a Nestor. Consequently, any approach to this mass of material must be selective and as far as possible along new lines. In the compass of this article one main theme is presented; it is a provocative problem which recurs like Plato's “sound of the flute in the ears of the mystic.” How was it that this program of studies, predominantly classical, rigid in its academic monopoly in grammar schools and colleges, amplified itself into such a variety of ideas and such differences of opinion in a cluster of colonies second only to the ancient Greeks in cultural activity? How did the *trivium* of grammar, rhet-

oric and dialectic, and three-quarters of the *quadrivium*, arithmetic, geometry and astronomy, the direct descendants of scholasticism, fit into the American scene? Was it a springboard or a hurdle?

After we sketch the requirements for admission to the nine pre-Revolutionary colleges and the schedules of the colleges themselves, this “provocative problem” may be applied to certain aspects and phases of the Colonial Mind. First, there is the astonishing preponderance of college men as leaders. There is also the by-product of this classical system in the ups and downs of the democratic dogma and the theory that even the Indians should have the benefit thereof. The trends of the graduation and Masters' theses, the gradual harmonizing of Greco-Roman testimony with theology and the effect of this ancient tradition on American literature are outstanding examples, not so much of mere imitation and “influence” as of the proliferation of this theoretical training into the practical lives and activities of an era and a people to whom ideas were more important than techniques. There is a sharp dividing-line between the conceptual world of two

hundred years ago, with its theory of progressive excellence and its cumulative "Chain of Being,"² and the empiric methods of today; and the pleasant Platonic assumption that the universe is governed by rational principles is now out of date. The time-honored *Querelle des Anciens et les Modernes* does not concern us, nor the debatable theory of "mental transfer," nor the valuation of knowledge vs. aptitude tests, nor the relative merits of agrarian or industrial civilization. It is irrelevant to contrast the stagecoach with the jet-plane, or Franklin's kite with Sputnik.

Solidly classical, the college entrance requirements³ remained the same for a century and three-quarters. The only addition was a dash of arithmetic. When John Winthrop's nephew George Downing, who gave his name to the London street, applied for Harvard, he was asked to "understand Tully, Virgil, or any such classical authors, and readily to speak or write true Latin in prose, and have skill in making Latin verse, and be completely grounded in the Greek language." Most of the textbooks were written in Latin; that language was to be used on all academic occasions; and he was so well trained that he was later able to converse at length with Cardinal Mazarin in Latin. As late as 1816 Horace Mann entered Brown on the same terms, with the additional prescription of "suitable testimony of a blameless life and conversation."

There was no surrender in the classical requirement of the colleges. The standard grammar schools and the high-powered tutors in the South answered the challenge. The "ceiling" of the Boston Latin School was an acknowledged model. In 1710 a boy who had reached his seventh year in this ladder of learning was reading Cicero's orations, Justinian, the Latin and Greek Testaments, Isocrates, Homer, Hesiod, Vergil, Horace, Juvenal and dialogues in Godwin's *Roman Antiquities*, as well as turning the Psalms into Latin verse.⁴ The prevalence of the ancient

atmosphere is evident in the tribute paid to the famous headmaster Cheever⁵ by his alumnus Cotton Mather, who loved him as Crito loved Socrates:

Having learnt an oration made by Tully in praise of his own master (the poet Archias), they should not be outdone by a pagan in gratitude. . . . Verrius the master to the nephews of Augustus had a statue erected for him; and Antoninus obtained from the Senate a statue for his master Fronto. I am sorry that mine has none. And Cato counted it more glorious than any statue to have it asked *Why has he none?* But in the grateful memories of his scholars there have been, and will be, hundreds erected for him.

A century later Jonathan Homer found the program more classical than ever:⁶ "I entered Lovell's in 1776 at seven years, and studied Latin from 8 o'clock to 11, and from 1 till dark. I entered college at the age of fourteen, and was equal in Latin and Greek to the best in the Senior class."

The many boys who were sent over to English schools were fed on the same pabulum. A letter from John Laurens⁷ to his father, later President of Congress, tells of Latin homework for Westminster School: "Little Harry sits busy at my side, making his verses for Monday morning . . . a little while at making one or two quicker than he is accustomed . . . he exalted and exclaimed 'Apollo favors me to-night.'" There were plenty of polite rebels like Jacky Custis the stepson of Washington, and Ben and Bob Carter of Virginia who fought a genial rear-guard action against the system. Ben was discouraged, "as tho' he actually believed in what Mrs. Tayloe told him last Sunday, that without he understands Latin, he will never be able to win a young Lady of Family and fashion for his Wife."⁸

The first completely recorded college curriculum,⁹ with detailed courses and textbooks, was that of Harvard in 1723. Its only real difference from the mid-seventeenth-century program was the offering of geography. Freshmen reviewed the "classic authors learned at school." New Testament Greek, logic

and rhetoric occupied the attention of those who were "cohabiting for Scholastic communion whereby to acuate the minds of one another." Logic, Greek and Hebrew were food for sophomores. The third-year men were exercised in disputations on ethics, metaphysics, geography and Heerebord's *Meletemata Philosophica*. Charles Morton's *Compendium Physicae*, taught from a manuscript, continued the Aristotelian tradition, though by degrees shading into the more natural doctrines of Ramus. Chaldee or Syriac gradually faded. For seniors, geometry was provided from Alsted; and their natural philosophy (physics) was made scripturally safe by the *Medulla Theologiae* of William Ames. Every two weeks or thereabouts "disputations" in Latin were held. A final thesis wound up the work for the baccalaureate, and after three years many presented *quaestiones* for the final accolade of a Master's degree. In the period between 1642 and 1723 we find some astronomy, the nature of plants (a summer field-course), politics (a partner of ethics), history and "Divinity Catechetical."

The Princeton program was even more classical. Described by President Witherspoon on a money-raising tour at Jamaica in 1770, it announced, "First year: Latin, Greek, classical antiquities, and rhetoric; second year: one ancient language, geography, philosophy, mathematics; third year: language, mathematics, natural and moral philosophy." The fourth year was devoted to "the higher classics, mathematics, natural and moral philosophy, history, literary criticism, and French if desired."

By this time the outside world was entering the classroom. The Copernican theory, first taught in 1659, was accepted. Bacon, Newton and Descartes edged their way into the program. The political rather than the metaphysical Aristotle began his impressive influence as an analyst of "mixed government." Telescopes, globes, hydrostatics, the orrery and electrical apparatus made their appearance as pioneer

contributions to the march of science. David Bushnell, a Yale sophomore, was the inventor of a *machina quae ad naves Bostoniae portu pulveris pyrii explosione distruendas nunc est fabricata*.¹⁰ But economics, social relations, government, and systematic laboratory courses were creations of a later day; the forum, the statehouse and the independent inventor furnished the "life-experience" material. Presidents gave extracurricular lectures on all conceivable subjects; and undergraduates, all taking the same program, explored outside the college schedule in their informal conferences and their abstract debates. The College of Philadelphia, in a highly cosmopolitan community, led the way with a medical school, though still insisting on the classical base, and as a concession to modernism established a special mathematical division. But the new prospectus for King's College (Columbia) endeavored to break the mould in the process of higher education. In 1754 Samuel Johnson announced:

It is the design of this college to instruct and perfect Youth in the learned languages and the Arts of reasoning exactly, of writing correctly and speaking eloquently; and in the arts of numbering and measuring, of surveying and navigation, of Geography and History, of Husbandry, Commerce and Government, and in the knowledge of all Nature in the Heavens above us and in the Air, Water, and Earth around us, and the various kinds of Meteors, Stones, Mines, and Minerals, Plants and Animals, and of everything useful for the comfort, the Convenience and Elegance of life—And finally to lead them from the study of Nature to the Knowledge of themselves and of the God of Nature, and their duty to themselves and one another.

There could be no more Platonic or comprehensive climax of education than this. Even the magnificence of the unfulfilled claims implied in the prospectus commands our admiration.

Bearing in mind our general query, how it was that such a rigid curriculum produced so many outstanding personalities in Colonial affairs, we may ask

our first question, which answers itself. Anyone who has read deeply in American biography cannot help being impressed by the proportion of college graduates whom historians agree upon as leaders in our provincial period.¹¹ The Massachusetts Bay region contained 130 British alumni by the year 1646. A collection of portraits of men who came to America before 1701 shows one-third possessed of university degrees. Clergymen in Virginia between 1607 and 1785 to the extent of one out of four were trained in the home country. Over one hundred young men returned to England or some transatlantic source for their higher learning. A count of the Americans who up to the year 1815 enrolled at the London Inns of Court reaches a total of 19 from Massachusetts, 21 from New York, 23 from Pennsylvania, 29 from Maryland, 49 from Virginia and 74 from South Carolina. The middle provinces were especially interested in the medical school of Edinburgh, where theses were required to be written in Latin, although a canny Scot connected with the University Latinized them on a black-market basis "for a consideration." Dr. John Morgan, in his inaugural discourse at the University of Pennsylvania in 1765 recommended "Greek, in which were the original treasures of medical science, Latin, as the common language of physicians and scholars, and French, as needed for current professional literature." Leyden was also prominent in the medical picture.

The record of the signers of the Declaration and the Constitution, with their frequent invocation of classical testimony, reveals the close connection between their academic training and their political contributions. Twenty-seven men with college background out of fifty-six supported the Declaration (of whom Harvard furnished eight), and twenty-three out of thirty-nine (of whom Princeton supplied nine) committed themselves to the Constitution. Nine champions of Federal Union had stu-

died at the Inner or Middle Temple in London. If we add to these groups a numerous body of Tories, in the main American-born, the facts are striking. Furthermore, the historian cannot ignore the many influential statesmen and scientists who acquired the equivalent of a college degree by their own self-taught efforts. A good example is the first Governor Wolcott of Connecticut who, according to President Stiles, "did not go to school, but knew Latin."

The proportion of college men is still more striking if we go back to those who, as the Romans expressed it, "deduced" the first settlers. The individuals mainly responsible for British migration were with few exceptions the product of Oxford or Cambridge. Coddington of Newport and Oglethorpe of Georgia seem to be the only front-rank founders with no college experience; and even the latter had matriculated at Oxford before entering the army. Baron De la Warr, who might be called the first real governor of Virginia, and John Mason, the disappointed patentee of "Laconia" (now New Hampshire), hailed respectively from Queens and Magdalen of Oxford. Among the pioneer Germans we may include Pastorius, Muhlenberg and Count Zinzendorf. The 1801 cabinet of Jefferson was composed entirely of college graduates — the President from William and Mary, Madison and Robert Smith from Princeton, Lincoln from Harvard, Granger from Yale and Gallatin from the higher schools of Geneva.

A second question raises itself at this point, as in one of the old Roman *controversiae*. How does this prominence of college graduates in Colonial affairs harmonize with the great American democratic dogma? The degree-less conquerors of the frontier, the happy New-World farmer whom Crèvecoeur sketches so charmingly as emancipated from the atmosphere of Roman ruins and classic decay, the immigrant in general — all these are historically important. They made their way in a land of opportunity. But this very opportu-

nity was equally available in the field of education. Bacon's statement that "the generall Counsels and the Plots and Marshalling of affairs come best from those that are learned," leaves leadership wide open to all. Free schools (except in certain backward regions), the Bay Colony law of 1647, the Pennsylvania statute of 1683, the compulsory elementary education of apprentices indicate that the colonists were on the lookout for youth of promise. Many secondary institutions took boys without tuition charge. The farm lad whose bills were paid in grain or pigs or cider, the "log-colleges" in the Middle States and Virginia, with special funds "for poor and pious youth," prove that any able individual was welcome. John Wise, the son of an indentured servant, worked his way through Harvard and spoke of his Alma Mater as "the place, if not of the goddess Minerva or Apollo, yet the Bethel and temple of God himself." Records show that as soon as the frontier settled into permanence and reasonable prosperity, this school and college curriculum was approximated as soon as possible, as in the case of Lexington, Kentucky.¹² When Hugh Brackenridge, applying to Princeton, apologized to the President for his poverty and quoted the famous lines from Juvenal, *Haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat res angusta domi*, the dour but kindly Witherspoon replied: "There you are wrong, young man! It is only your *res angusta domi* men that do emerge."¹³ There were social layers, based on property; but there was no class cleavage in the old-world sense. This classical program was an intellectual instrument for both conservatives and radicals (as in the case of Sam Adams and Governor Hutchinson), for Tories and Whigs, for the adventurous immigrant and the comfortable proprietor. Jefferson, the arch-exponent of agrarian democracy, urged a complete system of free public education for his native state, culminating in a university career which took for granted a

knowledge of Greek and Latin; and about the same time he wrote¹⁴ to his nephew some recommendations for pre-college reading which included nearly all the Greek and Roman historians, the poets and dramatists, the philosophers, and Shakespeare, Milton, Pope and Swift. Roger Williams, the extreme "leftist" of New England, drew upon the ancients far more copiously than did his opponent John Cotton, the bulwark of aristocracy.

The prevalence, as well as the democracy, of this classical program is proved by the fact that it was regarded as the duty of the settlers to offer its advantages to the Indians.¹⁵ Here was what we might call "an error in the fourth dimension." In the early Bay Colony youthful Red Men were catechized by Wilson, Shepard and Eliot in the form of queries which derived from the problems posed by Socrates and the Stoics two thousand years previously. "If a man should be inclosed in iron a foot thick and thrown into the fire, could the soul come forth thence or not?" "Suppose two men sin, of whom one knows that he sins and the other does not know it, will God punish both alike?" One Indian received the B.A. degree at Cambridge; one fell by the wayside; and one died in college. The successful candidate became an expert in Greek and Latin verse. A report by Governor Spotswood of Virginia, November 11, 1711, mentions the pains taken to send the son and the cousin of the Queen of the Nansemonds to William and Mary. Dartmouth seems to have been more successful. A visitor to the Indian camp after Wayne's victory at Fallen Timbers told of a conference with Chief White-Eyes, who had attended Dartmouth and read Greek books in the wilderness. Joseph Brant and Samson Occum, alumni under Wheelock, raised funds on both sides of the Atlantic for the move from Lebanon to Hanover. Two distinguished classicists, however, adopted a different policy. James Logan of Pennsylvania, translator of the *Disticha Catonis*

and Cicero's *De Senectute* for Benjamin Franklin's press, welcomed the Indians to his country place at Stenton and suited his intellectual pace to theirs. William Byrd of Westover took a whimsical view of the situation: he compared their mythology with that of the ancients and recommended the French habit of intermarriage, on the ground that it was a social and political problem rather than an academic one.¹⁶

If this Greco-Roman program, prevalent in American and transatlantic schools and colleges, was both democratic and conducive to leadership, our next query or, to use Plato's phrase, our "third wave," may concern itself with those elements in the curriculum which trained for service to the community. Yale's early degrees qualified a man as *instructus ecclesiae* or *ornatus patriae*. The climax of this higher education was the graduation thesis and the master's *quaestio*.¹⁷ Here is almost a chronological mirror of the Colonial Mind, from abstract metaphysics and academic dialogue to the burning issues of Independence. This became, so to speak, a training-ground for the application of Aristotle, Cicero, Polybius and other classical masters to the debates on the Declaration and the Constitution. The thesis originated in Scotland, the *quaestio* stemmed from Oxford. The former was an acid test of technical reasoning, in Latin, on a given subject dealing with logic, or rhetoric, or philosophy, or physics, or mathematics. As time went on, *theses politicae* became more frequent. A broadside sheet, on the Edinburgh plan, was distributed or posted. A query was to be attacked or defended. These were a medieval inheritance, descendants of the ancient *suasoriae* and *controversiae*. The theory of mental training was implicit, and it was assumed that the required skill would carry over into church or state or forum, as well as into the meditations of the creative writer. The speakers knew the five points of an oration from

Cicero and Quintilian, the *exordium*, *narratio*, *refutatio*, *exhortatio*, *peroratio*. Some of the future ministers had read the *Ecclesiastes* or *Ars Concionandi* of Erasmus, a book of homiletic hints. Those who could "draw the heads" of a sermon had modernized the ancient formulas into *text*, *application*, *doctrine*, *division* and *use*.

Theses in the first three American colleges were seldom political, for obvious reasons, until church and state grew independent of each other. Early topics were metaphysical and speculative: *Universalia non sunt extra intellectum* or the standard *Quicquid est in intellectu prius fuit in sensu*. One student contended that matter and form could not exist separately. William and Mary, few of whose theses are extant because of a fire, rebelled at the Aristotelian syllogism: the records of their debates show extensive use of ancient history. "Was Brutus justified in having his son executed?" "Is an agrarian law consistent with the principles of a wise republic?" Yale ran to science and theology; Princeton to rhetoric. To some students this was heavy going: in 1663 we find some mock-theses. A Harvard scholar declared *Geometres est Nebulo angularis* ("A geometrician is a cross-grained blockhead"); and later at the College of Philadelphia a wag maintained that "A too rapid succession of ideas is often the cause of insanity." But the issues of the day began to creep into the cloister. Dudley Woodbridge asked the old Roman question in 1699: *An Salus Populi Suprema Lex*, and answered in the affirmative. The master's *quaestio* of Andrew Eliot in 1740 claimed that "absolute and arbitrary monarchy is contrary to reason." Matthew Cushing's topic in 1742 was "Civil laws which are against nature are not binding on the conscience." In 1698 monarchical government was defined as "the best"; in 1723 a speaker said "No" to the question: "Is the royal power absolutely by divine right?"

Between 1743 and 1762 five speakers

held that civil government originates from compact, as did John Adams in 1758. The bachelor thesis of Ezra Stiles at Yale in 1746 was *Jus regum non est jure divino haereditarium*. Sam Adams was saying nothing especially new in 1743, for Milton, Locke and the familiar text-book of Althusius had made the same statement: "Is it right to resist the highest authority if by doing otherwise the State cannot be preserved?" Answer, a positive "Yes." From here on, college platforms ring with the Law of Nature and Popular Representation. A Latin "syllogistic debate" was held at Princeton approving the dictum of Ulpian: "All men are free, by the Law of Nature." Theology had eased its fetters; for we note an address holding that "No religion is rational without liberty of conscience." A Brown graduate of 1769 opposed taxation without representation, and another from the same institution declared that a defensive war was justified. This was in 1774, the same year in which a Princeton student applied the popular slogan *Bellum Servituti Anteponeendum*. Discussions on matter and form gave way to declarations such as the Brown thesis of 1773: "Have not the American colonists the same rights as the inhabitants of Great Britain?" The word *democracy* was sparingly used; but its equivalent was often in evidence.

Both *controversiae* and *suasoriae* were frequent, in their modern application, throughout early New England. The particular issue was the conflict of pagan writings, so large a part of the academic program, with Puritan theology. It is evident in the pamphlet war between John Cotton and Roger Williams.¹⁸ Before he left England, Cotton had been commended by his group for leaving off "rhetorical ornaments" and for denouncing those who "prefer the Muses before Moses, and taste Plato more than Paul, and relish the Orator of Athens far above the Preacher of the Cross." Charles Chauncy spoke the rec-

onciling words in a Commencement sermon of 1655:

All truth comes from the God of Truth. Who can deny but that there are found many excellent and divine morall truths in Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Seneca, etc.; and to condemn all pel-mel will be an hard censure. . . . If one abolishes all the learning that the heathen men have uttered out of the light of Nature, it will be a great oversight.

Even Michael Wigglesworth, who often castigated himself for backsliding in matters of revealed religion, had distinguished himself in a college address of 1651, starting with Lucretius, Aristotle, Democritus and Epicurus, and moving on to Bacon and Gassendi, "to prove that an interspersed vacuum existed in Nature." But the adjustment was made, and the classical message took its place as a vital adjunct and a clear second in the education of both theological and spiritual as well as civic leaders. One characteristic solution was by means of "typology,"¹⁹ the comparison of a Biblical personality with a "good" pagan. There was an ascending climax in the order of Hercules, Samson, Christ. Even living worthies were thus rated: Chauncy himself was given the allegorical prototypes of Cadmus and Polycarp. It was familiar in secular usage: Washington was a "Fabius," Eaton of Connecticut a "Cincinnatus." Another trend, characteristic of the eighteenth century and disapproved by strict churchmen, was deism. Primarily philosophical and theological, it had many political overtones. Jefferson and Franklin took it seriously. Lovejoy identifies it with neo-classicism,²⁰ "the doctrine that artistic merit is to be determined by universal suffrage," promoting "intellectual equalitarianism," and relying on the Law of Nature, Cicero and the Stoics. Those who opposed it and those who approved it invoked their classical models.

The great prose writers of provincial America—Franklin, Bradford, Woolman, Paine—were definitely non-academic. The first two were at home in

the Greco-Roman tradition, but only on a basis of self-taught study. The other two rejected any classical models and wrote as champions of specific issues. In poetry, the case was otherwise. Out of seven who may be regarded as superior, Anne Bradstreet has left us a few beautiful personal lyrics and much ancient lore, quarried from Raleigh and DuBartas. Edward Taylor²¹ has been called a "Hellenistic Puritan." Tomp-son composed an epic of the Indian wars, modeled on the *Aeneid*. Livingston praised the sweets of solitude, in pastoral style. Hopkinson is remembered for his satire and some harmonious lyrics. Trumbull's mock-epic "Mac-Fingal" and Freneau's revolutionary denunciations of the Tories are redolent of Vergil and Horace and Juvenal. Freneau, the most professional and powerful of them all, entitled himself "a genuine son of Neptune and Clio," and was hailed by his friends as "the Tyrtaeus of the Revolution." They are all reminiscent of the classroom, and may be regarded as preliminary heralds of Bryant and Emerson who transmuted their Classics into new creative forms.

The almanac²² was another link with the ancient world. Besides horoscopes, weather-predictions, guidance to the farmer and the sailor, the editors turned to classical mythology and history as seasoning of their techniques. Franklin and Leeds sparingly employed the wisdom of Publilius Syrus and Aesop; but the forty numbers edited by young Harvard graduates in the seventeenth century reveled in mythological personification, rifling Cato, Varro and Manilius for metaphoric definitions of the "Signs." A sample of intra-Zodiac relationship is taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*:

As Phoebus scales the lofty skie,
The sullen Crab's enraged ire
Will put him to a stand to spie
Where he in safety may retire.

So did the Ames dynasty of calendar-makers on the eve of the Revolution,

moralizing on the Roman virtues as the crisis approached.

But mere rhapsodies do not present an accurate picture. The leaders of opinion, college-trained, were in a minority. With increasing provincial prosperity there was need for "vocational" studies. New ventures, privately supported, sprang up on the secondary level.²³ Some of them "played safe," to cover college Latin and equipment for business. At sea-going Portsmouth in New Hampshire we find navigation "gauging" and "tonnage," added to the grammar-school curriculum. In Philadelphia, "Indentures, Accounting, and Bonds," as well as "Trigonometry, Plain, Parallel, and Current Sailing." A Maryland school offered, besides Greek and Latin, "Merchants' Accounts, Surveying, and Navigation." French, swordsmanship and dancing were occasional concessions to fashion. Young men training for army service could find classes in Fortification and Gunnery; and in the libraries of Standish, Greene, Washington and other officers were included the military treatises of the ancients, especially Caesar, who was conspicuous by his absence from most school curricula until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Voices were occasionally raised against the requirements for higher education. Parents asked for Comenius and his *Ianua Linguarum Reserata*. Roger Williams, in London with Milton, tutored boys with a minimum of grammar by what we call the "Direct Method."²⁴ Anthony Benezet, the Philadelphian, objected to the amoral tone of Horace and Ovid: Numa was a better model than Romulus. Plutarch and Xenophon should be edited for youthful pupils.²⁵ The Reverend Hugh Jones, in his *Present State of Virginia* (1724), held that there should be more science, along with commercial and agricultural courses. Old Dominion boys should have "polite and mathematical learning conveyed to them in English, without going directly to Rome and Greece. They may be good scholars

without becoming Cynics, as they may be good Christians without appearing Stoics." William Penn, a Christ Church classicist who quoted Greek philosophers in support of his Quaker doctrine of the Indwelling Spirit, recommended the study of "things" rather than "words" for young pupils, advising the postponement of Latin until age twelve.

A thorough reading of all possible material between 1607 and 1789 leads us to the conclusion that this educational program, with its manifold by-products, was relevant to the cultural and civic needs of a new national experiment. William Pitt evidently thought so,²⁶ when he spoke in the House of Commons on January twentieth, 1775: "I have read Thucydides and admired the master-states of the world. No nation or body of men can stand in preference to the General Congress at Philadelphia." A realistic confirmation of Pitt's tribute may be found in the career of John Witherspoon, the President of Princeton, who²⁷ illustrates the proverb *Abeunt studia in mores*. He made Greek and Latin a functional part of English style, and a guide for moral philosophy second only to the Scriptures. His pupil Madison thought so much of his teaching that he returned after graduation for a year's further study, emphasizing "the sages and legislators of antiquity." Academically, clerically and politically, Witherspoon's Common-Sense philosophy, which blended theory with practice, paid off in its results. His influence was so profound that his alumni, with a few duplications, occupied positions in the early years of the United States to the extent of: a President, a Vice-President, ten cabinet officers, twenty-one senators, thirty-nine congressmen and twelve governors, not to speak of the vivid Freneau, regarded by the majority of critics as the first American poet of distinction. This directness was characteristic of the Colonial leaders: they spoke their minds with a vital clarity that left no doubt as to their meaning, and reduced semantics to its right pro-

portions. As we began with Epictetus, so we may end with Hazlitt's *Essay on Familiar Style*: "The proper force of words lies not in the words themselves but in their application."

Cambridge, Massachusetts

¹ For a preliminary summary of the whole field of Greco-Roman impact on American provincial life, see R. M. Gummere, "The Heritage of the Classics in Colonial North America," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 99, no. 2 (April, 1955).

² A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, 1936); Ernst Mayr, "Agassiz, Darwin, and Evolution," *Harv. Lib. Bull.* 13 (1959) 166-73.

³ E. C. Broome, *A Historical and Critical Discussion of College Entrance Requirements* (New York, 1902); E. P. Cubberley, *Readings in the History of Education* (Boston, 1920).

⁴ K. B. Murdock, *Pub. Colon. Soc. Mass.* 27 (1927) 21-29.

⁵ Elizabeth P. Gould, *Ezekiel Cheever, Schoolmaster* (Boston, 1904) p. 51; Samuel E. Morison, *Builders of the Bay Colony* (Boston, 1930) pp. 184-85. For Cheever's famous textbook, *The Accidence*, see John F. Latimer and Kenneth B. Murdock, "The 'Author' of Cheever's *Accidence*," *CJ* 46 (1951) 391-97. The references in this tribute are to Plato, *Crito*; Cic. *Arch.*; Suet. *Gram.* 17; Fronto, *ad Marc.* (ed. Naber, p. 223); and Plu. *Cato Major* 19. 4.

⁶ R. F. Seybolt, *Public Schools of Colonial Boston* (Cambridge, 1935) pp. 73-74.

⁷ *Letters on the American Revolution*, ed. F. R. Kirkland (New York, 1952) vol. 2, p. 13.

⁸ *Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774*, ed. H. D. Farish (Williamsburg, 1945) p. 104.

⁹ There is rich material in S. E. Morison, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1936) vol. 1; A. O. Norton, "Seventeenth Century Harvard Text-Books," *Pub. Colon. Soc. Mass.* 28 (1928) 361-448. Also, histories of the various Colonial colleges. For two sets of books needed by Yale students of 1726, see *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. vol. 1, series 4* (1852) pp. 43-44.

¹⁰ For Bushnell's invention, see Ezra Stiles, *Itineraries and Correspondence* (New Haven, 1916) pp. 530-31.

¹¹ For full evidence on this topic, see Howard M. Jones, "The Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century," *Mem. Amer. Acad. Arts and Sci.* (Boston, 1946); E. Alfred Jones, *American Members of the Inns of Court* (London, 1925); Willard Connely, "Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge," *Amer. Oxon.* 29 (1942) 6-17; *Virg. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.* 21 (1913) 196-99 and 433-34; *Portraits of the Founders*, ed. C. K. Bolton (Boston, 1919-1926); James M. Beck, *The Constitution of the United States* (London, 1922) pp. 52 ff.

¹² K. Duncan and D. F. Nickols, *Mentor Graham* (Chicago, 1944) p. 10, list the classical books in

James Graham's shop. For Wise's phrase, see his *Churches' Quarrel Espoused* (Boston, 1860) p. 173.

¹³ *Sat.* 3, 164-65; Varnum L. Collins, *President Witherspoon, A Biography* (Princeton, 1925) vol. 1, p. 141.

¹⁴ *Jefferson's Writings*, Memorial Edition (Washington, 1905) vol. 5, p. 82.

¹⁵ For these Indian references, see Convers Francis, *Life of John Eliot, The Apostle to the Indians* (New York, 1840) pp. 92, 102; Morison (above, note 9) vol. 1, pp. 352-60; Lloyd Lewis, Sherman, *Fighting Prophet* (New York, 1932) p. 4; Ezra Stiles, *Itineraries*, ed. F. B. Dexter (New Haven, 1916) p. 41; John Fiske, *The American Revolution* (Boston, 1891) vol. 2, p. 83.

¹⁶ J. S. Bassett, *The Writings of Colonel William Byrd* (New York, 1901) p. 9.

¹⁷ Quint. *Inst. Orat.* 3.9.1. Lists of titles are given in James J. Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers of the Republic* (New York, 1935); E. J. Young, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* 18 (1881) 125; Morison (above, note 9) vol. 2, pp. 580-638. For a few of the end results, see Jonathan Elliot's *Debates in the Constitutional, and the State Conventions* (Washington, 1827-30 and 1836); G. Chinard, "Polybius and the American Constitution," *Journ. of the Hist. of Ideas* 1 (1940) 38-58; James Otis, *Some Political Writings*, ed. C. F. Mullett (Columbia, Mo., 1929); Mullett, *Fundamental Law and the American Revolution, 1760-1776* (New York, 1933).

¹⁸ See R. M. Gummere, "Church, State and Classics: The Cotton-Williams Debate," *CJ* 54 (1959) 175-83.

¹⁹ K. B. Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness:

History and Biography in Puritan New England," *Church History* 24 (1955) 221-38.

²⁰ A. O. Lovejoy, "The Parallel of Deism and Classicism," *Mod. Phil.* 29 (1932) 281-99.

²¹ Willie T. Weathers, "Edward Taylor, Hellenistic Puritan," *Amer. Lit.* 18 (1946) 18-26.

²² R. M. Gummere, "The Classical Element in Early New England Almanacs," *Harv. Lib. Bull.* 9 (1955) 184.

²³ See, among many cases, L. B. Wright, *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies* (New York, 1957) pp. 110, 131, etc.; R. F. Seybolt, *The Private Schools of Colonial Boston* (Cambridge, 1935); Edgar W. Knight, *A Documentary History of Education in the South before 1860* (Chapel Hill, 1949-1953); L. G. Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," *William and Mary Quart.* 5 (1896-1897) 219-23, continued in vols. 6 and 7.

²⁴ *Narragansett Club Publications*, vol. 6 (Providence, 1874) pp. 261-62.

²⁵ For Benezet and Jones, see George S. Brookes, *Friend Anthony Benezet* (Philadelphia, 1937); the latter's work was published in Sabin's *Reprints* (New York, 1865). For Penn, see his *Reflections and Maxims* (Philadelphia, 1850) pp. 1-2.

²⁶ Peter Force, *American Archives* (Washington, 1837-1853) Fourth Series, vol. 1, pp. 917-38.

²⁷ See R. M. Gummere, "A Scottish Classicist in Colonial America," *Pub. Colon. Soc. Mass.* 35 (1944) 146-61. Also impressive was the flow into public service from William and Mary; see Daniel E. Motley, *Life of Commissary James Blair, Founder of William and Mary College* (Baltimore, 1901) p. 41.

BOOK REVIEWS

editor FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

A Handbook of Greek Art, by GISELA M. A. RICHTER. New York: Phaidon Publishers Inc. (Doubleday and Company Inc.), 1959. Pp. vi, 421. 507 illustrations. \$7.95.

THIS IS PROBABLY the best-written and surely the most elegantly illustrated general study of Greek art that has yet appeared. Miss Richter states in her preface that it is meant to "serve as a general introduction both for the serious student and the intelligent amateur." And what a handsome introduction it is! It is copiously illustrated with well-executed photographs of most of the objects she is describing. These illustrations, fortunately, are not appended as a series of plates, but appear conveniently placed throughout the text. Miss Richter has taken great pains to assemble the best illustrative material possible. Her list of sources is therefore long, and it is a pleasure to find figures drawn from such works as Furtwängler and Reichold, Pfuhl, Dinsmoor and Rodenwaldt, as well as great numbers of excellent museum prints.

It is wrong, however, to place too much emphasis on the eye appeal of this book, for it is not just another collection of pictures. These are important only in relation to the story of Greek art as it is brought before us by Miss Richter.

The author does not profess to be writing the final word on Greek art. Each time a new topic is to be considered, she is careful to remind us that it will be treated only in outline. While detail is certainly avoided in the description of the individual monuments, there is an attempt to bring into the discussion objects and artists that are not too well known, so that the reader may get a glimpse into the whole panorama of Greek art that lies behind the better-known monuments.

The organization of this handbook is essentially that of the now out-dated *Handbook of Fowler and Wheeler* which it is meant to supersede. Besides bringing the information up to date, Miss Richter has added sections on furniture, textiles, glass, ornament and epigraphy.

It is a pity that some discussion of pre-classical art could not have been included. However, certain limits must be placed on such a broad study. The author has her hands full in treating Geometric to Hellenis-

tic times and is justified in including only a few general comments on the chronology and cultural development of early Greece.

A brief history of Greek architecture follows the chapter on preclassical Greece. This resumé is both useful and necessary since, as the author herself says, "in ancient times sculpture was largely architectural, paintings decorated the walls of public and private buildings, and the 'minor' arts, such as pottery and furniture, served their chief functions in private houses." She deals first of all with the mechanics and materials of Greek architecture and then passes on to mention each of the many Greek building types, dealing with everything from temples, treasuries and theaters to gymnasia, private houses and hotels.

In her discussion of Greek sculpture which follows, Miss Richter uses a chronological arrangement and does not attempt to duplicate the somewhat more involved organization of her detailed work *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*. She is careful in this chapter to inform the reader yet again that she is looking for the main differences in style from one period to the next and not for minor subtle modifications.

The statuettes and small reliefs are included in the next chapter, where we find an interesting cross section of Greek miniature work in bronze, ivory and wood.

Decorative metalwork, terracottas, gems, coins, jewelry, paintings and mosaics all come in for brief treatment in separate chapters.

Greek vase painting takes up most of the remainder of this survey. Here Miss Richter, keeping to her chronological organization, first discusses the products of the Geometric and Archaic periods and then passes on to the techniques and history of Athenian vases. She includes here most of the better-known potters and painters, concluding with an account of the West Slope Ware. The rest of this chapter consists of sections on Boeotian, South Italian (written by A. D. Trendall) and Hellenistic vases.

Very little in the way of Greek furniture has been preserved, but Miss Richter has put together an interesting chapter using literary references, vase painting and sculptural representations as well as the

few pieces of furniture that have come to us from the drier climate of Egypt and the Crimea. Chairs and stools, footstools, tables, chests and cupboards all are mentioned. In spite of the general lack of artifacts, the study of Greek furniture is interesting for the light it sheds on Greek life in general. For those who wish to know more about household furnishings in ancient times, there is the author's *Ancient Furniture, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman*.

The survey concludes with a few words on textiles, glass and glaze, ornament and epigraphy. The latter is included because at certain times "the letters in Greek inscriptions are so beautifully formed and spaced that they constitute works of art."

A survey such as this should serve not only to inform the reader, but also to stimulate a desire for more detailed information on the topics discussed. The author has provided for this eventuality by appending a chapter-by-chapter bibliography which is made up of "a few fundamental works . . . and recent studies, especially those in which the objects mentioned in my text are described at greater length." Despite these protestations to the contrary, the bibliography is very full, containing both scholarly and popular work.

A chronological list of Greek sculpture

with cross references and a Glossary of terms complete the book's usefulness.

Nothing, then, has been overlooked in this outstanding exposition of Greek art. Probably it would not be an exaggeration to say that it will long remain the standard work of its kind. Everyone with an interest in Greek art should have a copy.

EDWIN S. RAMAGE

Indiana University

The Story of Trojan Aeneas (from Vergil's *Aeneid*, Books I, II and III), edited by E. C. KENNEDY and BERTHA TILLY. Cambridge Elementary Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959. Pp. xxi, 135. 8 plates.

THE PREFACE of this little book indicates that it was put together, chiefly at least, for the use of sixth-form students in English schools. The editors state (p. vii) that their aims are to "tell in connected form the story of Trojan Aeneas" and to "give some interpretation of poetry that is among the most brilliant ever written in Latin," meaning in particular the poetry of the second book of the *Aeneid*.

To accomplish the first purpose the editors (using the Oxford text except for the substitution of -es for -is as the accusative plural ending of third declension nouns) choose from the first three books of the *Aeneid* some 744 lines dealing specifically with Aeneas and the events which befall him. The title of the book suggests that Aeneas is to appear in his character as a prince of Troy rather than as a later leader in Italy. This impression is also given by a statement in the Introduction (p. xvii) that the passages used "illustrate the beliefs current in Vergil's day about the supposed Trojan origins of the Roman race and of the *gens Iulia*" and are "a storehouse of those legends of Latium that told of ancient places and customs, connected in Roman thought with refugees from the fall of Troy."

The selections from Book I, totaling 139 lines, include the introductory passage which summarizes in seven lines Aeneas' past, his eventual destiny and the troubles he is suffering to fulfill that destiny. The next passage includes Venus' complaints to Jupiter and the latter's confirmation of his earlier promise that Aeneas will conquer the tribes of Italy and father a long line of noble descendants. The other two selections from Book I describe Aeneas' encounter with his mother when she appears as a Tyrian maiden (a scene in which he hints at the disasters he has faced since sailing from

"No teacher of Latin can afford not to experiment with the book for a year."—*Classical Journal*.

"Deserves the thoughtful and careful perusal of any classics teacher interested in progress."—*Classical Bulletin*.

LATIN:

A Structural Approach

by Waldo E. Sweet

Teachers: for a free booklet by Professor Sweet about the structural method, write to:

The University of Michigan Press
Department F
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Troy) and Aeneas' feelings as he stands before the Carthaginian temple looking at the carvings of remembered battles and heroes in the Trojan War. These excerpts emphasize Aeneas' past difficulties and reveal outstanding traits of his character.

The passages chosen from Book 2 total some 593 lines, almost three-fourths of the text of this little book. This uneven division follows the editors' expressed aim of laying stress upon the study of the brilliant poetry of Book 2. These passages recount Aeneas' activities during the last night of Troy's existence, including his escape from the city with his father and his son after losing his wife. The 12 lines of Book 3 which are given tell how Aeneas and the other survivors build ships and finally sail away from the Trojan area dutifully carrying the gods of Troy to a new home.

Thus the account of "Trojan Aeneas" as given in this book describes his activities in Troy, presents his character as it had been developed by his trials and responsibilities and merely hints at the difficulties and honors which await him in Italy. This is perhaps a reasonable limitation of material, for it is clear to one who has read the whole of the *Aeneid* that Aeneas has, by the time he reaches Carthage, developed the virtues and traits which Vergil considers suitable for the ancestor of the Roman people, and he does not appear to grow much in character thereafter. Thus, though another editor might vary the choice of passages somewhat, the text of the book does give a good picture of Aeneas the Trojan.

It should be mentioned that the omitted parts of the first three books are told in succinct English paragraphs inserted at the appropriate points. Also each Latin passage is preceded by a brief summary in English of its contents. These English sections should give the student an adequate idea of the whole story to the point where Aeneas and his followers set forth from the region of Troy.

Besides its 35 pages of Latin text, the book offers a number of very helpful aids. The thirteen-page Introduction provides material on Vergil's life and writings, on the story of the *Aeneid*, on the character and place in legend of Aeneas and his importance in Roman tradition, and on the verse form used in the *Aeneid*. In general the style here, as in notes throughout the book, is simple and clear, easily readable for students without being so elementary as to be boring. The editors seem, in fact, to have a talent for coming to the point of a discus-

FIFTY-SIXTH
ANNUAL MEETING
of the
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
OF THE MIDDLE WEST
AND SOUTH

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

April 14-16, 1960

Housing in the University's Georgia Center
for Continuing Education

See the complete program in the
March number of CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

sion without wordiness or unnecessary ramification.

Much help with the translation and an unusual number of enlightening comments on antiquarian matters are supplied in 55 pages of notes. There are also explanatory remarks about versification and poetic devices although not perhaps quite as many as one might expect in view of the second aim quoted above. One might suggest at first sight that Latin phrases and sentences are too often translated outright where suggestions about grammar and syntax would have enabled the student to make his own translation. The editors explain, however, in their preface, (p. vii) their feeling that "too much erudition and too little guidance" are offered in the standard editions and their intention of remedying this flaw by giving more help than usual in the notes in order that "an appreciation of the text may be quickly reached."

The advanced notes, of which there are 12 pages, are intended, according to the preface, as background material for the use of teachers and sixth-form pupils. These notes are discussions of important subjects and ideas mentioned in the text and are interesting enough, it seems to this reviewer, to inspire further reading on the part of some good students.

The thirty-two page vocabulary is comprehensive and gives the forms and facts which are needed for complete mastery of new words.

The eight very excellent and clear photographs which come between the notes and the advanced notes are all closely related to the text and should increase the student's interest by helping him to visualize certain events and people.

In appearance this is an attractive little volume in a bright binding decorated on the front cover with an outline sketch (made from one of the photographs already mentioned) of Aeneas leaving Troy with his father and his son. The print is clear and reasonably large, and the pages are not crowded.

The book is, for the most part, remarkably free from errors. On page 23 the English summary seems, probably as the result of the poor wording of a sentence, to say that Hecuba was butchered in the palace of Priam. In view of the behavior of Aeneas in the *Iliad*—or rather perhaps in view of the tendency of certain deities to snatch him out of danger before he had a chance to prove himself—the statement on page xvii that he is regarded equally with Hector seems somewhat excessive. In the middle of page xvii the antecedent of "it" is so uncertain as to leave the reader vague about just what

the editors are designating as the "storehouse of those legends of Latium." So far as arrangement of material is concerned, it seems unfortunate that notes should be placed at the end of the text when so much of the student's time would be saved if they were placed at the bottom of the page.

On the whole this is a book which the present reviewer can fully recommend. It is to be suspected, however, that the editors' statement that the "sixth-form student should be able to read this book unaided" (p. vii) would apply to very few seniors in American high schools. This remark is, unfortunately, a criticism not of the book but of American schools!

HAZEL M. TOLIVER

Lindenwood College

Latinskii Iazyk (The Latin Language), by A. N. POPOV and P. M. SHENDIAPIN. Moscow: Publishing House for Literature in Foreign Languages, 1958. Pp. 388.

THIS WORK is the fourth edition of the most popular Latin textbook in use in the Soviet Union; it has been approved by the

write for your free copy*

VERGIL'S AENEID: A Structural Approach. Part One: The Aeneid, Books I and II, with a Latin Interpretation and Selected Notes from Servius-Donatus.

Prepared by Waldo E. Sweet

Based on the structural approach, Professor Sweet's new book is designed for second-year students of Latin in high school or college. Regarded as a significant advance in teaching method, it is ideal for teachers without previous training in linguistics. The intensive drills in Latin and English not only advance the student who has learned Latin by the structural method but adapt themselves easily for use in conjunction with any Latin text or any other teaching approach to Latin.

*When writing for your free examination copy, be sure to give the name of your school and the name of your course. Address requests to:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

Department F

Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR for State Universities and Teachers' Institutes. The book has a number of interesting and important features, and its present position in its own educational system can best be appreciated from a brief sketch of the history of Latin studies in the Soviet Union.

These studies have had a rather checkered career since the revolution of 1917. At first the country was too absorbed in the problems of civil war, intervention and reconstruction to have much energy left for other pursuits. Moreover, the early years of the Soviet regime were characterized by a sharp reaction to what was termed the "scholasticism" of the Latin and Greek language courses that had bulked so large in the curriculum of Tsarist gymnasia. The twenties were also the time of the slogan which claimed that everything old should be "swept into the garbage-can of history"; the new Proletarian Man would create a new Proletarian culture. Needless to say, the ancient world fared very badly in this environment. The historical and philological colleges in the universities, which had been inherited from Tsarist times, were closed in 1921, and thus virtually all Latin and Greek instruction ceased in the Soviet Union. Among the very few exceptions to this policy were two institutes of historical studies, one in Leningrad and one in Moscow, but their influence was limited, since they had very small enrollments and the country was greatly preoccupied, first with the New Economic Policy and then with the Five-Year Plan in industry and agricultural collectivization.

Nevertheless, the government desired to maintain a supply of people trained in the ancient disciplines. One of the chief reasons why it wished to do so was that Marx and Engels and their followers regarded the ancient world as one of the essential steps in the ascending ladder of the Marxian dialectic; thus, the disappearance of classical studies would seriously retard work on the "ideological front," as history and related fields were often called. As a result, two special institutes for the study of philosophy, linguistics and literature were opened in Moscow and Leningrad, both of which made provision for classical-language study. During the thirties these institutes were absorbed into the rapidly expanding Moscow State University and Leningrad State University systems, where their former classical "sectors" continue to function as departments of classical philology to the present. There was at the same time an unspectacular but steady growth in the number of departments of classical philology established

in the universities of the affiliated SSR's, such as Georgia, Azerbaidzhan and Armenia, as well as in parts of Russia itself — Kazan on the Volga and Tomsk in Western Siberia. The Ukraine had been a strong center for classical studies for over four hundred years; the universities in Kiev, Kharkov, Lvov and other Ukrainian cities resumed their work in ancient language and literature. The first edition of *The Latin Language* was published in 1939; its very appearance testifies to this general growth and development.

In 1944, during the final stage of World War II, the government passed a decree to strengthen existing instruction in classical philology and to initiate this study in a number of universities that had not formerly given it, including several of the larger Teachers' Institutes in Moscow. However, in spite of the government's interest, frequent complaints were heard that opposition emanating from within the various educational ministries themselves was frustrating the program. In view of the size and population of the Soviet Union, with its emphasis on mass education, it cannot be said that classical studies are thriving. Yet some progress has unquestionably been made; it is significant that recent appeals for more work of this kind have been based on aesthetic rather than ideological considerations. This is one of many signs that indicate the greater sophistication and maturity that is now appearing in Soviet discussions of cultural matters.

The Latin Language is the work which introduces students to Latin in almost every Soviet institution of higher learning. It reverses the usual format of grammar and exercises, or story and grammar, by putting the reading and translation material in the first part of the book and the grammar and syntax in the second, in a sequence that does not exactly correspond. At first the students are required to translate from Latin to Russian and from Russian to Latin, but the latter diminishes as the Latin sentences become more difficult and complex.

Short passages of connected narrative illustrative of various aspects of ancient civilization begin with the fifth lesson. The seventh and following lessons consist of sentences taken from the work of ancient authors, and on the lighter side the book offers a few hoary jokes, such as *Aegrotus et medicus*. Lesson 19 (p. 31) forces attention to a problem that even teachers of advanced Latin are often glad to avoid, Roman numbers. Here is the first of nine sentences for translation into Latin in this lesson: "The year has 12 months, 365 days,

and 8760 hours." No avoidance here!

Beginning with number 23, the lessons afford practice in syntax, such as the ablative absolute, the uses of the subjunctive and the conjunction *cum*. These are continuous narrative passages taken literally, not adapted, from Latin authors down to Gellius and Seneca. This exercise material, comprising 67 pages, constitutes the first unit of the first part of the book. It is followed by approximately 40 pages of vocabulary, in which each selection has its own individual entries.

The next unit is entirely devoted to longer continuous narrative. Nepos, Caesar, Livy and Cicero are the prose writers; the poets are Horace, Vergil, Catullus and Ovid. An essay on the achievements and significance of each author introduces the selections from his works, and the notes which follow are suggestive rather than exhaustive. The necessary vocabulary must be found at the end of the book. This first part of the book concludes with a few excellent translations from the best-known Roman poets made by distinguished Russian men of letters. For example, a friend of Turgenev and Tolstoi, A. A. Fet, who enjoys a high reputation as a creative artist in the galaxy of nineteenth-century Russian writers, has contributed a beautiful version of *Odi et amo*.

The second part, which begins on p. 191 and comprises approximately 70 pages, presents a comprehensive outline of the essentials of Latin grammar. It is followed by another 70 pages of syntax. The book ends with a short treatise on scansion, which analyzes lyric meters as well as dactylic hexameters, and complete Latin-Russian and Russian-Latin vocabularies.

Judged by any pedagogical standard the book is difficult, but the restrictions that have been placed on its use, to which the authors have deliberately responded in the fourth edition, make it an even more formidable production. It is designed to be used by college freshmen who have had no previous Latin training, and the time allotted for instruction in this subject in Soviet universities has recently been reduced to a total of 160 hours. This means that *The Latin Language* must be completed in a period comparable to three American college semesters. With this limitation in mind it is interesting to examine one of the grammatical sections in detail.

The first four pages in the second part of the book treat Latin inflection in general and the first two declensions in particular. They list the regular rules of gender, number and case, and a comprehensive table sets forth all inflectional endings for all five declensions.

The paradigm and the regular rules for the first declension are followed by the information that a genitive and dative singular and a nominative plural in *ai* are found, as well as a genitive singular in *as*, in a word like *paterfamilias*.

After the regular paradigms of representative second-declension nouns in *us*, *um* and *er* comes the special declension of *vir* and a note to the effect that old Latin recognized a dative singular in *oi*. The regular adjectival paradigms are accompanied by complete rules for retaining or dropping *e* in the *er* forms, including a handy jingle to help students remember when retention occurs in words of high frequency: *puer, socer, vesper, gener, liber, miser, asper, tener*.

All the possessive pronominal adjectives, from *meus* to *suius*, are to be learned now as regular second-declension adjectives, and this sequence includes the irregular masculine vocative singular *mi*. This is followed by rules for all the mutations found in second-declension vocatives, plus notes on the inflectional anomalies found in such words as *deus*, *locus* and the eight adjectives resembling *unus*. The difference in meaning between *alter* and *alius* is stressed, as well as the fact that the nominative and accusative neuter singular of *alius* and similar pronominal adjectives ends in the letter *d*; and *uterque* receives the special attention that it deserves. Rules are given for determining the *us* nouns that are feminine, and *vulgus*, with its neuter gender, is specially mentioned. The section ends with a caution to distinguish carefully among the *e*-retaining second-declension adjective *liber*, the second-declension masculine plural noun *liberi*, the *e*-dropping second-declension masculine singular noun *liber* and the regular first-declension feminine noun *libra*: One would have to go to Allen and Greenough's *New Latin Grammar* (which is generally considered more a teacher's aid than a freshman classroom text) in order to obtain more detailed information. It should be noted that the drills in the first part of the book include practice with the irregularities and anomalies as well as the regular forms.

Obviously, the students who use this book must fully understand complex grammatical constructions before they start upon it, in order to make satisfactory progress. The advantages in learning nouns and adjectives that Russian students presumably possess because they speak a language more highly inflected than Latin are more than offset by the fact that the Russian verb system differs so radically from the Latin that Russian does not even have names to designate

the various tenses and moods. Latin terminology has to be employed throughout for this purpose.

American teachers of the Classics, particularly of Freshman Latin, may well be amazed at the thorough and comprehensive approach to the language displayed by this book. It is also worth remembering that this text has been constantly in use in the Soviet Union for the past twenty years to teach a difficult discipline to students who elect to study it, and that classical philology is but one small part of the overall Soviet educational picture, certain aspects of which, in physics and rocketry, have recently been attracting world-wide attention.

It is a welcome, although belated, sign that a few modern American Latin texts have been hailed as "new," when all that they have done is to rediscover the time-honored virtues of hard work and mental discipline. It is necessary for us to realize, and *The Latin Language* helps to prove this fact, that the educational system in the Soviet Union has never lost sight of these cardinal principles.

HUGH F. GRAHAM

University of New Mexico

Plauto. Amphitruo, Casina, Curculio, Miles Gloriosus, testo latino con traduzione a fronte a cura di ETTORE PARATORE. Florence: Sansoni, 1959. Four vols., pp. 122, 136, 88, 176. Paper covers, L. 1200, 1200, 1000, 1500.

THESE CONVENIENT and handsome editions of four Plautine plays are an Italian parallel to the French *Les Belles Lettres de Paris* editions. They compare very favorably in appearance and in quality. Each volume contains the text, an adequate apparatus criticus, translation into colloquial Italian prose and introductions ranging from 22 to 54 pages.

The texts show that Paratore is not slavishly bound to any previous editor; he chooses such readings from among them as seem justified and proper to him. He does not offer many suggestions of his own. The apparatus are excellent for any points of importance and are not cluttered with minor or unimportant variations.

The introductions deal with three subjects: the dating of the plays, the problems of construction and the *Fortleben* of each drama. Paratore's approach is refreshingly sound and departs signally from the subjective aesthetic type of criticism characteristic of so much recent Italian scholarship, and particularly in Plautus (e.g., Della Corte, Perna, and, to a less extent, Arnaldi and di Lorenzi).

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SUMMER QUARTER
JUNE 20 - AUGUST 19, 1960

Classics Program

June 20 - July 20

LATIN AND GREEK: Intensive beginning courses in both languages; advanced course in Roman Epic; supervised study and graduate reading courses in both languages.

LATIN TEACHERS' COURSE: 1) classroom methods and materials; 2) supplementary background material for teaching high school Caesar.

CLASSICS IN ENGLISH: Greek and Roman Drama.

RESIDENT FACULTY: Professors McDiarmid, Grummel, Rosenmeyer, Pascal, Read.

CONCURRENTLY:

Institute of Linguistics

Romance Language Teachers' Seminar

Write for brochure and full information to:

PROFESSOR J. B. McDIARMID
CLASSICS DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE 5, WASHINGTON

The discussions of the structure of the plays are clear, precise and relatively conservative, but not dogmatic (as are so many of the theories he cites). In the *Miles Paratore* sees definitely the classical example of *contaminatio* and argues strongly against theories of unity or rehandling of a single theme. He finds no evidence of *contaminatio* in the *Amphitruo* and opposes the Leo-Kakridis tradition of mixture based on the *nix makra* motif. In the *Curculio* rehandling is evident (especially in the choragus motif), and *retractatio* is quite possible in some places, but no combining of two plays. He follows generally Leo's theory of the rehandling of the *Casina*. Following the introduction to the *Casina*, Paratore comments on work published while his editions were in proof, particularly G. Rambelli (*Comica Graeca-Latina*) and Mattingly's recent revolutionary theory ("The Plautine 'Didascalical,' " *Athenaeum* 35 [1957] 78-88) which seeks to overturn the cornerstone of Plautine chronology, the didascalical notices of the *Pseudolus* and *Stichus*. This Paratore vehemently and, I believe, soundly attacks.

JOHN N. HOUGH

University of Colorado

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER will award a classical scholarship, covering full tuition for two years, to that member of next year's freshman class who intends to major in Latin or Greek and who is judged to possess the highest qualifications among those competing for this award. The scholarship holder whose work shows distinction during the freshman and sophomore college years may reasonably look forward to receiving financial aid during the remainder of his or her undergraduate career, possibly even up to the amount of full tuition.

It is expected that applicants will have completed four years of high-school Latin. Some work in Greek would be welcome, but is not required.

Interested persons should write to Dr. Robert S. Cope, Director of Admissions, Galpin Administration Building, The College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. If an application for admission has not already been filed, this should be done *at once*.

THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY offers ten grants-in-aid for study at its ninth Seminar in Numismatics to be held at its museum, June through August, 1960. These grants will

be available to students of high competence who will have completed at least one year's graduate study in Classics, Archaeology, History, Economics, Art History or other humanistic fields. Applications will be accepted also from junior university or college instructors with a degree in one of these fields. Each study grant will carry a stipend of \$500.

The program of the Seminar will include attendance at discussions conducted by visiting specialists in selected fields, preparation of a paper on a topic of the student's selection, and actual contact with the coinages related to that topic. Problems will be treated which relate to such as the following: the evidential value of coin hoards and excavation coins, coins and the early history of Greek city states, constitutional, social and religious policies as reflected in Roman coinage, Byzantine art history from coins, migration and imitation of mediaeval coin types.

This offer is restricted to students or junior instructors at universities in the United States and Canada. Further information and application forms may be obtained from the office of the Society, Broadway between 155th and 156th Sts., New York 32, N.Y. Completed applications must be filed by March 1, 1960.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published eight times a year, from October through May.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general price is \$3.75 (U.S.A.), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (U.S.A.), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single-copy rate. Subscriptions may be taken through one of the regional associations listed below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may receive also the CLASSICAL OUTLOOK and CLASSICAL WORLD; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of taking either the CLASSICAL JOURNAL or CLASSICAL WORLD.

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the secretary-treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, PAUL R. MURPHY, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. CANE, CLAUDE W. BARLOW, Clark University, Worcester, Mass. CAAS, F. GORDON STOCKIN, Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y. CAPS (Northern), MISS MARGARET SMUTZ, 2525 N.E. Glisan St., Portland 12, Ore.; (Central), EDWARD Y. LINDSAY, 3480 Del Paso Blvd., North Sacramento 15, Cal.; (Southern), MRS. LOUISE M. J. JONES, 24262 Sage Ave., Boron, Cal.

CORRESPONDENCE

All general editorial correspondence, MSS, etc. to NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Department of Classics, Indiana University, Bloomington. Departmental material to the proper editors. MSS from the Atlantic, New England and Pacific states to these regional editors. Concerning subscriptions and details of circulation to PROFESSOR MURPHY (address above). On advertising and other business items to J. D. SADLER, Furman University, Greenville, S.C.



THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

